# WHY WE MISBEHAVE

LANE MEDICAL LIBRARY STANFORD
K692 .S34 1928 OLD
Why we misbehave / by Samuel D. Schmalha
24503208301

SAMUEL D. SCHMALHAUSEN

LANE

MEDICAL

LIBRARY

*Gift*

C E Shepard
Stanford University

K 692
S 34
1928

LANE MEDICAL LIBRARY
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
MEDICAL CENTER
STANFORD, CALIF. 94305

WHY WE MISBEHAVE

# WHY WE MISBEHAVE

BY SAMUEL D. SCHMALHAUSEN

*author of*

HUMANIZING EDUCATION

NEW YORK · THE MACAULAY COMPANY

MCMXXVIII

LANE LIBRARY, STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Copyright, 1928,
By THE MACAULAY COMPANY

First Printing, August, 1928.
Second Printing, September, 1928.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

K69
534
1928

DEDICATED

TO

SIGMUND FREUD
ALFRED ADLER
CARL JUNG

*Three philosophic physicians who created*

THE NEW MEDICINE
THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY
*and*
THE NEW EDUCATION

*Pioneers in the science and art of*

RE-EDUCATION

Acknowledgments are gratefully due the following Journals for permission to reprint portions of these Studies: *The Psychoanalytic Review, Psyche, International Journal of Individual Psychology, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, The Modern Quarterly, Journal of Delinquency, Birth Control Review, School and Society*

# INTRODUCTION

The nineteenth century has been referred to as especially marked by the great strides man was able to take as the result of scientific development in the control of his environment, and the present century is still hopefully regarded as the century which may shift the emphasis to man's control of himself. If such a shift in viewpoint, or better yet such addition to our viewpoints, which would be in line with Dr. Schmalhausen's suggestion that we should learn to formulate our increasing knowledge in terms of "both and" rather than "either or," should happily take place it would be because of an increasing tolerance of mind which is brought about by just such examinations of the present-day significance of the fundamental concepts which we have inherited from the past as Dr. Schmalhausen attempts, and this examination is just what is going forward in this age and is the special signficance, as I see it, of this particular book.

This is coming to be possible largely as the result of "the psychiatrizing of academic psychology" and the growth of a "humanized psychology" and the "recognition of the essential psychologic nature of social concepts," which Dr. Schmalhausen specifically emphasizes, and as a result of this emphasis he formulates the out-

standing contribution which Professor Freud has made to our understanding of human motives in the following words: The "exposé of the staggering human cost of sexual frustration I look upon as the ultimately important contribution of Freud."

From this broad and tolerant background Dr. Schmalhausen discusses the question of sex in its various ramifications as it affects human behavior in its social manifestations, emphasizing the importance of the contribution of psychiatry and of the mental hygiene movement.

The book is trenchantly and interestingly written from a background of tolerance and wide information and is filled with ideas that are suggestive and provocative and as such should invite wide reading and serious consideration.

No one can contemplate the changes which have occurred within the past few years without a feeling of great sympathy toward every effort that is made to unravel the factors that are responsible, unless, perchance, he be such a hide-bound conservative as to have lost all capacity for the consideration, understanding and assimilation of ideas that differ from those which were originally instilled in his mental constitution.

A detailed discussion of the ideas set forth in this volume would of necessity be as voluminous if not more so than the book itself and each reader will naturally gather those things which are to him peculiarly attractive. It is, however, from such discussions multiplied

many times and each in turn exciting the interest and the contemplation of many readers that new ideas are born from which ultimately the truth, in the pragmatic sense of that which works, finally issues. And so I welcome this book as a catalyzer of human thought wherever it may gain access thereto. May it play its part in a benevolent revolution of ways of thinking which will finally result in as much understanding by man of himself as he now has of his environment.

WILLIAM A. WHITE.

Saint Elizabeth's Hospital
Washington, D. C.
February 10, 1928.

# CONTENTS

## PART ONE: PSYCHOLOGY AND LIFE


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I | Sex Among the Moderns | 13 |
| II | The Freudian Emphasis on Sex | 21 |
| III | The Rôle of Inferiority in Human Behavior | 45 |
| IV | Psychiatry to the Rescue | 71 |
| V | Is Prostitution Petering Out? | 105 |
| VI | Problems of the Sexes | 126 |


## PART TWO: HUMAN NATURE IN THE MAKING


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| VII | The Science of Re-education | 161 |
| VIII | Mental Hygiene: The Quintessence of the New Psychology | 165 |
| IX | A Psycho-Sexual Inventory | 201 |
| X | The Problem of Childhood | 228 |
| XI | The New Educational Psychiatry | 255 |
| XII | The Psychoneurotic Situation in Our Colleges | 268 |

# PART ONE

# PSYCHOLOGY AND LIFE

James Harvey Robinson quotes with approval the following extraordinary statement, in his book "The Humanizing of Knowledge":

A man of genius has recently declared boldly and rightly that it is a scientific fact that "the emotional life of man is *primary*." In the development of both the race and the individual "the human heart has the right of way . . . . Science must humbly reinstate itself as the instrument of humanity's desires. The needs of humanity render this no more imperative than does the perpetuation of science itself. And since intelligence does exist as the instrument of human need, intelligence must save its life by losing its pride." *

* Quoted by Robinson from "Bases of Bryanism," by Dr. T. V. Smith of the University of Chicago, in the Scientific Monthly, May, 1923.

# WHY WE MISBEHAVE

## Chapter I

## SEX AMONG THE MODERNS

There are three new phenomena under the sun; economic independence for women, the gulf between puberty and mating, and the logic of contraception.

There are three old phenomena under the sun; the economic dependence of women, puberty as the time of mating, the logic of fecundity.

A study of these contrasting phenomena will illuminate the two outstanding humanistic realities of our times: the psychologic breakdown of marriage and the compensatory prevalence of the new freedom in the love-life.

Marriage was stabilized on the basis of two important urgencies: economic need and reproductive anxiety. The woman either had to depend upon the man or was his profitable associate in enterprise. Both man and woman, more particularly the latter, felt the necessity of legitimate parenthood and honorable (because clean and socially approved) procreation.

The overshadowing fear of woman's life has been the fear of pregnancy. Under the ancient logic of fecundity, there was no help for it. Sex, mating, marriage, reproduction were all interlinked in a continuous series of

behaviors wrapped around with the mystic cord of sacred duty. Procreation was naïvely accepted as the aim and meaning of life.

The overshadowing fear of woman's life has been neutralized and marvelously set at rest by the technique of contraception. A nice question for the metaphysical dabblers in ethics is this: does the disappearance of fear leave woman with any 'moral' restraint on the impluse to mate?

One problem and only one troubles the minds of the younger generation: the problem of freedom in matters sexual. How should it be otherwise? Financial self-dependence, educational equipment stressing personality fulfillment, erotic enlightenment, the blessed certitude of prevenception, the emergence of informal comradeship between the sexes, and most significant of all, the shifting of the marital status from puberty to adult-maturity, have all conspired to elevate to a position of the first importance the problem of sex-expression in youth time.

Static morality has been repudiated in favor of dynamic experience. Fear yields its sovereignty reluctantly to fun. Virginity is sacrificed to felicity. Virtue, being its own reward, is bartered away in favor of love. Passion's coming of age heralds the dawn of a new orientation in the life of the sexes.

We may sum up the quintessence of the sexual revolution by saying that the center of gravity has shifted from procreation to recreation.

For the sake of a greater clarity of comprehension, let us pause to consider how man has handled his sexual situation historically. The co-existence of prostitution with honorable marriage is a fact that speaks too eloquently in

behalf of an unsolved inner contradiction in the emotional nature of man. That neurotic conflict may be visualized as the overlapping and interference of two impulses: the desire to worship the madonna and to embrace the whore. No one who is competent to analyze man's attitude toward the love-life can afford to diminish the importance of this deep dualism in his nature. The most ironic fact in human behavior is the evil circumstance that made man spend his spontaneous passion on prostitutes, leaving him with a stale residue of desire for his wedded wife.

Prostitution is the dark poetry of sex desire. That married women should have been so long morally blind and psychologically obtuse, contenting themselves with the vapid residuals of passion, is one of those colossal facts almost beyond comprehension. The prostitute gave to man with a coarse-playfulness what the dignified women of the race could never give with their sterilized sobriety.

Something strange and new and shatteringly real is happening in the world before our very eyes. I refer to the wonderfully intelligent and pathetically sincere attempt of respectable women to win back to themselves the sweet disreputable bliss of spontaneous sex desire squandered throughout the ages (and oh, so lavishly) upon courtesans, whores and prostitutes.

Though moral simpletons know it not, the younger generation is unwittingly seeking to solve the most baffling problem of life, to wit, freedom of love in a setting of dignity. The new candor in sex behavior is a very great step in the direction of interlinking the spontaneity of passion (until recently looked upon as quite shameful and therefore to be tolerated only as sneak behavior in

blind alleys under prostitute auspices) with the lovely dignity of compassion. Sexual love as happy recreation is the clean new ideal of a younger generation sick of duplicity and moral sham and marital insincerity and general erotic emptiness. Sex as recreation is the most exquisite conception of lovers who have learned to look with frank delighted eyes upon the wonder in their own stirred bodies.

From an analytic point of view what were the choices of the male, promising sex fulfillment? Only these: masturbation, prostitution, free love, marriage, and—abstinence. Realistically summarized, man's choices took the form of masturbation, prostitution, and marriage, with special preference for the last two. Woman's choices were largely limited to abstinence and marriage. The results whether viewed psychiatrically, psychologically, or sociologically have been disastrous, fertile breeders of distraction, unhappiness, misery and shame. Frustration and inadequacy were the inevitable by-products of these ways of living.

We confront a younger generation in clean and brave rebellion against these wretched choices for sex expression. A hygienic ideal, cleansed of hypocrisy, free from the misery of repression, is capturing the awakened minds of an increasing number of men and women who perceive in sexual comradeship a source of incomparable significance for personality-enrichment. To minimize the tyranny and humiliation of masturbation, to defeat the mad logic of abstinence, to cancel out of existence the unclean evil of prostitution, to purge conventional marriage of its coercions and inbreeding neurotic complications, in fine, to create more free and felicitous conditions for sex fulfillment, is the exceeding great task and perilous enter-

prise of liberated youth. *Passion radiantly humanized by compassion is our enriching new ideal.*

The charming conception of married love celebrated by Marie Stopes; the tender-hearted appreciation of companionate marriage wisely sponsored by Ben Lindsey; the clean scientific candor of sex-enlightenment found in the works of Ellis, Carpenter, Key, Schreiner, Meisel-Hess, Robinson, Robie, Popenoe, Dunlap, Sanger, Fielding, Dell, Gruenberg, Davis, Dennett; the universal tendency on the part of fine men and women to honor sex love as an experience of beauty and dignity, most persuasively embodied in the philosophy of Mrs. Bertrand Russell; what are these evidences of courage and candor if they be not signs of a new enlightenment?

Man's mind, for so many dark and dirty generations sexually torn between madonna and whore, seeks the recompense of a new and richer solace in a spontaneous passion-devotion to his sweetheart. The consolation of adoration which he once discovered in a sterile respect for the madonna; the compensation of vivid experience which he once could find only in the unclean passionate pursuit of the whore:—these disquieting loyalties have been laid to rest, harmonized in the profounder, because more sincere, dedication to sex love as a thing of dignity and beauty, without apology or shame. Thus we witness the birth of a new type in society, the lovable sweetheart who combines within her own personality the dignity of the madonna-conception with the free vivacity of the whore-conception. Man will no longer commit the insane folly (woman will not permit it!) of spending his spontaneous passion on prostitutes, leaving for his real mate the disingenuous passion of fatigue and marital duty.

We must cancel out of love's lexicon the shameful antitheses between passion and love, innocence and sophistication, purity and experience, virginity and marriage, desire and shame, adultery and reputability, love and lust.

Three interesting problems belong to our age of emancipation: the dignifying of genital desire, the humanizing of passion, and the assigning of social status to experimental relations. Underlying these momentous problems and yet outstripping them in general significance, is the problem of what I should like to call the *sexualization of marriage.*

Woman has developed sexual personality. She means to devote an increasing beautiful attention to the erotic life. Somehow she must contrive to give passion a freer reign in the realm of love.

The quintessence of the sexual revolution lies in woman's delighted acceptance of the love relation as recreation.

What we must not forget is the sheer inevitability of the new candor which expresses itself in the spreading prevalence of erotic camaraderie.

To sum up: marriage as conventional coercion is on the verge of bankruptcy. Marital love as ritual and routine is no longer honored as either sacred or sweet. Morality as the sheer perverse tyranny of abstraction is dethroned. Experience as the open sesame to life more abundant is being welcomed as essentially good.

Sexual love, for the first time in human history, will be universally honored as a quickener of life, an illuminator of human nature, an experience of infinite promise for woman as for man. Passion's coming of age symbolizes the culturally inevitable subordination of fecundity to birth control with its happy by-product of recrea-

tion in lieu of procreation as the inspiring bond of sex union.

Where all other panaceas fail, love may let save the world.

If in these perturbing times when old sanctions not yet outlived continue to poison by their stale antiquity the fresh experimental promise of the new morality, we confront a spiritual chaos in which auto-eroticism, abortion, adultery, constitute the major pathologic evidences of erotic awakening and the fierce desire for sexual felicity, let us be wise as befits the children of light, and philosophically realize that these emotional disharmonies are the inevitable mid-process between rigid repression and free expression. Life blossoms beautifully—even on a dung hill.

What few persons as yet clearly perceive is the relation between the contemporary drastic changes in morals and the first beginnings of that scientific revolution three hundred years ago which is responsible for all the changes in the modern world. Man confronted nature insolently and said: I am not to be deterred any longer from inquiring into the deepest mysteries, the most sacred intimacies of your behavior. I have invented a clever method of probing the most underlying truths of your existence. I call that method of trial and error the scientific technique of experimentation. Henceforth nothing shall remain closed and private and too sacred for my piercing and profane investigation. The scientific revolution, skeptic, blasphemous, merciless, is on. Long live the scientific revolution!

The sexual revolution is the most recent and the most profound phase of the scientific revolution: the drastic application of the principle of experimentalism to life

in all its personal aspects. The sexual revolution is inevitable.

The mother image fades into obscurity and out of that strange obscurity emerges the image of the sweetheart as the inspiration of man's life.

> It was the night, the night of all my dreams.
> Across the lofty spaces of that room
> You stole; and where the moonlight's silver streams
> Cloudily slanted in upon the gloom,
> More silver radiance met them where you moved;
> And all the beauty of that hazèd West,
> Wherein the moon was sinking, lay approved
> Because thus lay your pale, slow-curving breast.
> I shall remember, aye when death must cover
> My soul and body with its rayless tide,—
> The madness and the peace of that wild lover
> Drunken with life's whole wonder at your side.
> I shall remember in life's stormiest deep,—
> Even as that night I knew you there in sleep.[1]

[1] One of the many enchanting poems in Arthur Davison Ficke's book of magic, "The Sonnets of a Portrait Painter."

## Chapter II

# THE FREUDIAN EMPHASIS ON SEX

No criticism has been more often hurled at Freud than that he has stressed sex too much. The very insistence and universality of the criticism make one feel as if it were reasonably true. But, in another sense, the criticism is a dodge, sheer evasion. The dramatist uses a method of theatric condensation of experience which is intended to secure effective attention to a segment of experience. Not only is the dramatist not censured for this literal falsification of reality, he is, on the contrary, hailed as ingenious and creative if he is really able to make reality more vividly real by his dramatic exaggeration and theatric intensity. Freud as an artist in the subtle field of new ideas has indulged the luxury of dramatic falsification for the sake of imparting to the reluctant and resistant conventional mind the profound truth about the rôle of sex in civilization.

At any rate, Freud's high-power emphasis on sex has persuaded a whole world to pay attention to obscure realities long denied as non-existent (or at least unworthy of existence) and now more easily confronted as too important to be neglected by those who would call themselves enlightened. In this amazing sense, the Freudian emphasis on sex may almost be said to have created a new psychology of attention. No one possessed of a flexible mind can longer evade the truths first probed and published by Sigmund Freud, latterly acknowledged to be one of

the world's great geniuses. Part of his genius lay in his knowledge of how to impart to a squeamish and shamefaced mankind those fundamental insights into "the buried life" which a hypocritical morality, a humorlessly puritanic Weltanschauung, had completely ostracized as beneath the dignity of the conscious rational mind.

What new knowledge may be attributed to Freudian psychoanalysis? It is foolish to assert that any man, however great, can create a whole body of knowledge all by himself. There are always speculations and findings, delvings and procedures that form a kind of prelude to any apparently new branch of learning. In short, a true perspective can always discover a history of flowing facts in which the novel insights will be imbedded. So with the Freudian wisdom. Acknowledging as much, one may permissibly insist that certain psycho-sexual discoveries are Freudian in the momentous sense of having been given a powerful status in the world of thought only with the enunciation of psychoanalytic principles and procedures.

For example, who had ever heard of infantile sexuality as a widespread reality of the utmost significance for the evolution of the erotic life? Who had ever even begun dimly to realize the amount of auto-erotic behavior there is in childhood? Though a phrase like "polymorphous perverse" sounds grotesque enough to be humorous, the humor is somewhat abated in the presence of the sexual realities underlying. The interest of little children in urinating and defecating has frequently enough sexual contexts and complications that may drag with them into maturity obsessions, anxieties, compulsions, that plague the psychoneurotic of a certain species.

How many persons, before the Freudian ascendancy,

possessed the keenness to perceive in "crushes" a form of homosexuality, albeit rather innocent in the milder cases, and anything but innocent in certain other cases? How does it happen that the world has suddenly awakened to the startlingly wide existence among persons of high and low degree of homosexual attachments? Whatever is scientific and sane in our new attitude toward masturbation is almost wholly traceable to the courageous insistence of the psychoanalysts that auto-erotic practices constitute an inevitable phase of normal sex life.

What generations of young men and young women have suffered in private humiliation and remorse and shame and anxiety amounting to torture, it is difficult to visualize now that the life of youth has been freed from the horrible burden of self-accusation, of unclean conscience pangs, in the presence of a sexual behavior that is, under certain conditions of stress and strain, as natural and inevitable as breathing, exercising, dreaming, and kissing. The psychoanalysts are wise in simply having removed auto-erotism from the superstitious background of private self-indulgence, shameful and painful, and given it a simple unworried status of biologic urgency under certain perfectly human conditions of stimulation and tension. The light of publicity that has been shed upon this universal habit of the sexes has helped to ventilate the matter and to give it a scientific status at once wholesome and sane. The evil of masturbation could certainly not arise from the physical relief consequent upon unbearable tension; it must have resulted from the anxiety and brooding shame accompanying such self-conscious behavior, by its nature sneaky, awkward, and rather humiliating to one's personal sense of free will

and self-control which were being so obviously put in jeopardy.

As an American poet and philosopher, Max Eastman, has generously written: "Freud has made himself a wise and wonderful scientist of sex, and has given a gift of illumination to the world not second to that which Hobbes gave, and so we can forgive him if he somewhat overstrains the generalization, and tends to carry us back to a contemplation of oneness almost as bad as that of the sickly mystics whom he knows how to cure. He has at least lifted a great incubus of shame from the shoulders of humanity, and given the boon of candor to a poor animal desperately endeavoring to become a man."

The concepts introduced by the psychoanalytic way of thinking have not only given a new lease of life to psychiatry and psychopathology, but have insidiously undermined the abstractionist foundations of academic psychology with the utterly wholesome result that psychology nowadays, to be treated seriously, must be drastically dynamic. The *psychiatrizing* of academic psychology constitutes a revolution in itself, in the sedate halls of learning. No significant psychology written within the past ten years by an academical has failed to pay tribute (honorable or dishonorable) to Freudian insights. Illuminating concepts like infantile sexuality, mother fixation, narcissism, homosexual attachment, rationalization, complex, libido, compulsion, psychoneurotic, dream interpretation, the unconscious, have shed a wonderful light on the obscurer motivations of men, reavealing layers of desire in the troubled deeps of the subconscious mind to which the classic psychologists were for the most part gravel-blind.

It is not inappropriate to ask why so dramatic and

vital a reality as sex had been evaded so successfully by generations of philosophers, psychologists, medical men, thinkers in general? In retrospect the omission seems incredible. On the reasonable assumption that philosophers as a class were sexually a feeble brood, that psychologists were impotent or at least squeamish and repressed, that medical men labored under a theologic burden of shame and fear, that thinkers in general lacked the courage to confront their own human nature realistically, only on some such assumptions is it at all possible to understand the long neglect of a field of human reality more significant and interesting than any to which these experts had been giving their brilliant and often quite sterile devotion.

Another point of approach is the realization of man's childish delight in make-believe which he refers to as idealism. Man does not find it easy to absorb reality. The reason is clear at length. Reality represents disharmony, imperfection, evil. His infantile imagination creates a private universe in which harmony, perfection, good, rule as the holy trinity of the inner life. When confronted with the contradiction between his private imaginary universe and the public realistic world, his first tendency is to deny objective reality and to slide back into the comfort and reaffirmation of subjectivism. The ancient dualism between idealism and realism resolves itself into the conflict between infantile make-believe and mature disillusionment. Once we perceive how deeply rooted in his childish theatric nature is the disposition to accept illusion and to deny or flee from disillusion, we shall be close to the heart of the matter: pretence soothes the mind of man, reality disturbs it.

In relation to professional thinkers,—the professors and

the academicians,—a special selective tendency is at work to assign positions of importance in our institutions of learning to those persons whose human nature is not richly endowed emotionally. No man has ever been selected for a university job on the ground of his exceeding compassion for his fellow men. No woman has ever been honored with a professorship because of her loyalty to love. Men and women whose human nature is intense, emotionally sincere, erotically lyrical, sympathetically deep, are simply déclassé. Our institutions of learning are houses of refuge for men and women who are emotionally unfit for any of the more vigorous and realistic burdens of life: chalk-laden pedagogues, peddlers of anemic platitudes, sterile grammarians, cowardly passionless humans all.

The point of interest is to observe how these anemic professors are flirting with the realistic sexual interpretations of Freud and gradually, by the indirection and left-handedness congenial to academicals, are becoming the interested victims of the psychoanalytical ways of thinking. Evil, that is, life, always ill at ease in the academic groves, has of late begun to feel surprisingly at home in that make-believe environment. Freud (quite innocently) has made evil so fascinating that the more sprightly of the professors find his subject-matter as attractive as the forbidden passages in Shakespeare which as sophomores they had no moral right to read, and therefore, digested with an almost indecent avidity, on the sly. Psychology, even academic psychology, has had color and vivacity and galvanic shock imparted to it by the vital impulse of psychoanalysis. Freud has *humanized* psychology.

Why were we all so loath to believe that sex mani-

fests itself in earliest infancy? Why was it more congenial to believe that the sex instinct is non-existent until puberty arrives? Why in general did we find it consoling to think that sex belongs to maturity and can be safely neglected in infancy and in childhood and possibly in early adolescence? I suppose our unclean attitude toward sex is in large part responsible for our blindness and psychologic obtuseness. Then, too, our ignorant assumption that sex behavior cannot occur until a certain stage in physiologic maturity has been attained, was somewhat responsible for our silly philosophy of innocence. Nor must we neglect the influence upon our make-believe thinking of the moralistic conception of children (in particular, our own) as little angels, innocent darlings sprung from the chaste head of God, incapable of evil, that is, of sexuality. It was refreshing to believe that we were innocent once, in our infancy, however guilty we might feel now in our corrupt maturity!

Thanks to the evil influence of Christian morality (that is, of hypocrisy), we all surrendered to the foolish belief that sex was something to be ashamed of. What could be more natural, in view of this belief, than to falsify the simple lustful reality of conception, to cleanse childbirth of its sinful origin, to think of children as sexless (the compensation for our unforgettable knowledge of their sexual begetting). Thanks to Freud, we have become more vigorous, more honest, more intelligent, and best of all, more humble. If Freudianism had done nothing else than cleanse our hypocritical and prurient minds of the poison ethics of shame, all mankind (and even more truly, all womankind) would be Freud's eternal debtor. We are no longer ashamed of sensuality, appreciating in a new

and exhilarating sense the marvelous meanings resident in sexual potency.

Recently some experiments in the field of animal psychology have added surprising bits of new knowledge to our store. It had been taken for granted that nature once for all had laid down certain enduring reaction patterns which deserved, because of their universality and stability, to be called instincts. Instincts appeared to be modes of behavior beyond the power of man to tamper with, as he might with habits, for example. Instincts were assumed to be wholly unlearned reactions and therefore fundamental in the organism. Among these stable ingredients of the organism, none was conceived to be more eternal and reliable than the so-called sex instinct. All the activities centering around the impulse that leads to mating and offspring were envisaged as purely instinctive reactions. Thus, nothing seemed more natural than the assumption of an instinctive sex attraction between male and female. The surprising bit of new knowledge referred to above consists in the demonstration (by scientific experiment) of the essentially undifferentiated and far from fixed nature of the sex instinct.

Animals, for example monkeys, show no decided and inevitable preference for the opposite sex. Succinctly summarized, said animals enjoy (we'll call it that) the practices of masturbation and homosexuality, even as they appear to enjoy heterosexual relations. We discover no overwhelming evidence in favor of the traditional hypothesis that sex expression unquestionably implies the presence of both sexes, at least, so it had been argued, among the higher animals. The primary fact seems to be sheer undifferentiated sex tension. What mode of relief this tension shall take depends, not upon

eternally fixed patterns of response called instinctive, but rather upon the opportunities of the environment at the given moment. In the animal experiments, in the absence of the opposite sex, a male monkey had no hesitancy in mating with a small and youthful male of the species. Or, for lack of either male or female cohabitant, our lust-laden monkey will content himself with any object close by as a point of contact for the sheer mechanics of coitus. These unfamiliar facts reopen the whole problem of the nature of instinct.

Increasingly we must prepare our reluctant minds for the knowledge of the spreading cult of sexual behavior once looked upon as definitely pathologic and monstrous, latterly surveyed as within the field of human nature's true preferences. We are all becoming acquainted with abnormal sex practices. Whether we have in mind boarding schools, seminaries, college dorms, army life, reformatories, prisons, art colonies, monasteries, camps, in fine, any human center where one sex predominates, we are no longer shocked to learn of the existence of homosexuality, sometimes tentative and playful, sometimes deliberate and overt, not to mention more innocent sex behavior that would until the day before yesterday have been called even by sexologists, abnormal, in fact, pathologic. The big question confronting sexologists of the psychoanalytic school is this: Is there any form of sex behavior that may be called abnormal in the pathologic sense, and if so, from whose point of view? This troubling query introduces the expert at once into the more perturbing subject of perversions. One thing seems perfectly clear: it is no longer permissible for an enlightened person to be horrified by perversion.

Strangely enough, even Freud who has, in the face of

the most humiliating opposition from the respectable folk, habituated our reasonable minds to the wide permissible variety of sex expression, takes as his point of departure for sexual normality the ancient fact of reproduction. In such a view, the use of one's sex in ways that sidetrack libidinous desire from the true goal of mating drags in its train the possibility of perversion. In the most naturalistic view, perversion is sexual behavior that thwarts the aim of reproduction. Thus the true indictment of the "polymorphous perverse" sexual practices of children is the danger resident in them for infantile fixations that distort the evolution of erotic desire toward uninhibited heterosexuality. On the basis of such a logic, autoerotism, homosexual fixations, narcissistic sexuality, are all undesirable forms of sex expression because of the danger of arrested development at one of these immature levels. These are literally perversions in the sense that such behaviors sidetrack libidinous desire from "object love" which in a normal maturity means love of the opposite sex.

There are tendencies of a sociological and psychosexual nature in our age that make abundantly clear the subordination of the goal of reproduction to that of self-indulgence. Expressed more graphically, the contemporary cultural situation is subordinating procreation to recreation. If this be true,—no tendency in modernity appears to be more emphatically in the ascendant,—it is incumbent upon us to realize that what used to be called perversion has become the new normality. Sex is no longer being primarily used for purposes of reproduction. This singular fact must be our starting point for whatever enlightened thinking we are preparing to do in the attempt to enrich the life of the sexes in whatever ways

seem conducive to such enrichment. The old criteria of normality are no longer tenable. The new criteria are in the process of creation. Toward the creation of the new norms the variety of human nature and the potentialities of sex expression will make their significant contribution. What we of the puritanic tradition must courageously confront is the nature and extent of the sexual revolution that unfolds itself fascinatingly before our affrighted eyes.

Once we clearly envisage the sheer inevitability of the sexual revolution, the social and psycho-sexual forces that were predetermining the shift of the center of gravity from procreation to recreation, we shall be in a calmer mood to understand some of the eccentric by-products of so vast a change in sex fulfilment. Sex as duty (a theologic ethic) has gone the way of all wearisome and life-denying superstitions. Sex as delight (an æsthetic and psycho-analytic ethic) has captured the minds of men and women eager for felicity. With the bankruptcy of the older ethic as latterly manifested in the growing phenomena of experimental marriage, freedom in love, adultery, divorce, the candid acceptance of auto-erotism, the distinguished pleas for the rights of homosexuals, goes quite inevitably the emergence of a sexual ethics that *must* seem by antithesis the very quintessence of abnormality: what some would call pathology and perversion.

No theme is more deserving of our sincere and unfrightened attention than the new freedom in sex expression based upon the triumph of recreation over procreation as the goal of sex love.

The re-discovery of passion is the shining novelty of an age which has simultaneously discovered that woman possesses sexual personality. Henceforth, it is woman who will be setting the patterns of permissible sex be-

havior. Her emancipation from the bondage of fecundity has left her with a fund of erotic energy that must seek outlets in non-reproductive fashions. The speed and ease with which this newly emancipated female has taken to varietism in sex, hints at the supersession of ancient norms by ultra-modern ones. If the accumulating evidence in the case should plainly show that what men and women of another time had agreed, out of the depths of their sweet sexual reticence, to call modesty, has disappeared from the bosoms of respectable females, (an unreality that had never been more than a metaphysical pretence honored in a world of make-believe), we can the more serenely approach the new woman as the child of candor and life, the sworn enemy of sham and shame. The vital essence of the quite new morality is its reputable shamelessness. This contribution to the higher ethics is unchallengeably woman's.

Freud's brilliant conceptions of the mechanisms underlying psychoneurotic behavior were in considerable part provoked by his study of women suffering from various kinds of compulsions, anxieties, obsessions, which he traced to infantile traumatic occurrences and to fixations and distortions of the sexual impulse. It is not necessary to enter here into a critical discussion of the Freudian theory of the psychoneuroses. For our purposes it is enough to point out that the undeniable rôle of sexual frustration in the development of various of the psychoneurotic states has been illuminated most impressively by the Freudian technique. The vast amount of sexual suffering engendered in marriage by the intrusion of memories and attachments and traumatic experiences traceable to childhood has been clarified by psychoanalysis. The repressive power of conventional morality, the in-

hibiting force of parental fixation, the disturbing influence of unconscious homosexual trends, the doubts and anxieties engendered by fear and shame, the compulsions and obsessions that act as a screen for immoral desires, the rôle of oral and anal eroticism, the strange tenacity of certain sexual episodes having their dark roots in childhood,—all these matters, of the first importance to a realistic insight into the variety of sex behavior, are the patient contribution of the Freudian analysts. Such a contribution could never have been made except by a group of experts in whom candor and clarity had definitely triumphed over pretence and evasion.

The vivid concepts of sadism and masochism enrich our comprehension of human nature in a striking way. One need not point to pathologic cases of sadistic and masochistic behavior sprung from sexual perversion to realize that these components are widely distributed among so-called normal people whose erotic life is considerably influenced by one or the other of them. It is legitimate to supplement this notion with the rôle played by sheer ego-dominance which is quite as often responsible for these sexually perverse attitudes. The sadistic lover is evidently expressing his will-to-superiority quite as emphatically as his sheer exuberance of uncontrollable sex desire. Perhaps the imposing of pain is the most fundamental device at the disposal of humans for putting their personalities across at all costs. Even in the less plausible instance of masochism, of the desire to suffer pain, we may be witnessing a cowardly and abnormal form of the will-to-power embodying itself in a kind of wretched martyrdom. At any rate, in the play of such powerful tendencies as sadism and masochism, we behold remarkable instances of the interrelation and

overlapping of the fundamental factors of ego and sex, sometimes with the ego riding the situation, sometimes with sex in charge of affairs. There is a kind of egotism which is primarily sexual. There is a kind of sexuality which is fundamentally egotistic. This truth, which is somewhat wider and therefore more adequate than the Freudian or the Adlerian emphasis, deserves a more analytic study.

What is civilization? From a psychoanalytic point of view, civilization is a complicated device of repression and concealment, having as its major purpose the subordination of passion to social conformity, by means of the definite prohibition of free and easy sex expression in youth, and correlatively, by the sublimation of instinctive desire in socially useful modes. Civilization spells repression. To be perfectly accurate, let us say that conventional civilization spells repression. Perhaps men and women can build a new unconventional civilization which will not rest upon the props of repression and concealment. We shall see.

If we survey traditional civilization, we are impressed by one fact as always conspicuously present; the vast array of machinery of intimidation (physical, emotional, intellectual, spiritual) used by the authoritative elders to prevent the free and easy expression of sex desire. The times waited for a Freud to come along and make clear to a blind mankind how tragic the costs of this civilized machinery of intimidation. This exposé of the staggering human cost of sexual frustration I look upon as the ultimately important contribution of Freud. Why were the authoritative elders so concerned with preventing nature from being natural?

One explanation leans on ego-dominance, the other

explanation belongs to the life of sex. Can you imagine a more reliable source of self-importance than playing at the rôle of moral censor? The melodramatic thrill of moral superiority is the most exquisite kind of sadistic delight. To sit in judgment: that pose suits human nature beautifully. To find scapegoats for one's moralistic viciousness is the most interesting of pastimes. Those who have suffered deprivation and frustration can not be counted on to be generous. Their only source of compensatory satisfaction lies in a malicious kill-joy attitude that seeks to prevent others from enjoyment. In the field of sex, the kill-joy attitude is too familiar to leave us in any doubt of its evil potency. The elders of the tribe are in a holy-holy conspiracy to deny to the young the prerogatives of sex love because they themselves are debarred (by natural limitation or social taboo) from a similar happy indulgence. What they miss in sex fulfillment they seek to wrest from ego-dominance. Then, too, their dwarfish and tainted attitudes toward the spontaneity and adventurousness of passion and love have for so long marred their own capacity for highly evaluating romance and mating that they are really quite incapable of understanding why illuminated young bodies should yearn toward one another so madly. The virtue of the old is the virtue of impotence. The wisdom of the old is the wisdom of frustration. Deprivation from the experimental felicities of sex prompts the ego to make a last brave stand for compensatory status by brandishing the will-to-power over the heads of lawless youth who are too preoccupied in the quest of happiness to be impressed with the vicious demands of frustrated egotists for a place in the sun.

If conventional civilization has insisted on putting a

strait-jacket on the live passionate impulses of youth, the reason was by no means consistently rational. The fear of promiscuous parenthood played its inhibiting part, of course. But, psychologically, the essence of the true reason (obscured by rationalization) was simply the kill-joy jealousy of the young nestling poisonously in the hearts of the old. We cannot think graciously of a feast from which we are debarred.

Can civilization, under new psychoanalytic auspices, allow to sex the wide margins of pleasurable freedom it yearns for, without undermining those values deemed precious by men and women as *human* beings, sensitive, egotistic, wilful, self-conscious? A subtle warfare is on between the ego and sex components in human nature. Can the ego and sex forces do as they please, under a régime of freedom of personal impulse, without eventually introducing more torture into the relation of the sexes than we are as yet more than dimly aware of, in our inevitably hectic pursuit of self-expression?

The most interesting and important movement in America for applying rational and humanistic techniques to the study of the complicated problems of sexual maladjustment is the mental hygiene movement. Recently, Dr. Frankwood E. Williams, its director, has emphasized as of paramount importance in youthtime two problems, viz., emancipation from the home and the attainment of heterosexuality. These propositions imply two antecedent situations: the obsessive and distorting influence of over-emotional familial authority, and the existence of temptations and opportunities for sexual behavior that stand in the way of normal sex expression. The dependence of the child upon the parent; the dependence of the parent upon the child; the veiled incestuous bond that

may exist between parent and child where the emotional relation is exceedingly intense; the evil after-effects upon a child's development of having come under the sway of an authoritative father or an indulgent mother; the untoward consequences for the love life of the young of having dwelt for the most impressionable years with loveless or unhappy parents; the obviously bad influence of parents who, having failed frankly to confront and to solve their own erotic problems, nevertheless proceed, in their haughty blindness, to impose negations and taboos and repressions upon their growing offspring whose animalism and natural candor so often outrage and shame them;—these momentous problems have been brought to public consciousness by the hopeful new science of mental hygiene which has been inspired by the brilliant discoveries of Freud, Jung, Adler and a host of psychoanalytic-minded psychologists.

Not so long ago even the most enlightened persons assumed the naturalness and therefore the inevitability of heterosexual attachment. The wise admonition of Dr. Williams gives us pause. Are there any forces in contemporary civilization that tend to thwart normal sexing? I believe so. The rhythm of the jazz age has infected our sex life: no doubt of that. We seek stimulation incessantly. No one can reasonably deny that the old-fashioned sobriety of marriage with its spiritless ritual and routine of all work and no play has lost its coercion over the consciences of young men and young women. For the younger generation, fecundity is out of the question. The new gospel is one of frank fun and happy-go-lucky pleasure seeking. This shift in psychological atmospheres has brought with it a jazzing of sexual eagerness, a call for more zest, an open-hearted

invitation to sensual playful experience. When you consider how very easily normal sex behavior slides into a kind of monotonous ceremonial devoid of spontaneity or passional enthusiasm, you can catch the meaning of that flirting with the unusual, the forbidden, the immoral, which marks the new sexual regimen. We cannot evade the troubling fact that marriage and reproduction and normality and duty, whatever their status in heaven, are losing their ancient sanction on earth. The modern mad quest for stimulation is driving men and women into the arms of abnormality. Pathology promises novel sensations.

There are other vital points to be reckoned with. The physiological enlightenment that removes the mystery and the illusion surrounding sex; the general disrobing of the female in public that gradually habituates the male to a simple, athletic, and feebly erotic conception of the magic of sex (once dwelt upon by the race of man as the wonder of wonders); the all-pervading cult of contraception; the substitution of a mechanical deliberateness for a natural reckless spontaneity in the performance of the sex act; the disheartening simplicity, almost automaticity, of sexing in marriage; finally, the transformation of the very basis of life from one of sober duty and conscience pangs (for infringement) to that of drunken disregard and light-hearted self-indulgence;—these mutations in the philosophy and deportment of the sexes have contributed hugely to that search for recreation and playful erotic experience with which our neurotic age is acquainted.

What I want to stress is the inevitability of these changes. The older normality implied procreation as the goal of the sex life. The newer normality assumes re-

creation as the goal of the sex life. The difference is nothing if not revolutionary. The most radical by-product of the change in norms is the emergence of abnormal sexual experience with appropriate apologetic, rationalization, and reputable justification. Because these things are true, we must view heterosexual attachment as no longer the secure and sacred reality we were taught to believe it to be, in the nature of things, eternally. Homosexual attachment achieves increasingly a status of respectability. If normal sexual intercourse between men and women, shut off from the larger aim of reproduction, should find itself subject to the self-centered limitation of monotony and routine and passionlessness, as it is in danger of doing, what alternatives remain to the sexes for erotic zest and unique stimulation except those resident in playful experimental behaviors that approach by perilous degrees to abnormality and perversions. Doubt it not: pathology is woven into the very texture of contemporary civilization.

Matings should begin at puberty. Marriage, from a moralistic angle, should provide the responsible and sacred sanction for mating. *Apparently*, the simplest solution for sex desire would be marriage in earliest youth when puberty precipitates genital eagerness. What do we find? Sex desire begins as of old in puberty (much earlier, in fact, in many cases). Marriage, thanks to the unbearable demands of the economic and the cultural situation, what is blithely termed "the standard of living," has been deferred for men and for women until late maturity; between ages twenty-five and thirty-five for females, and between ages thirty and forty for males. The great gap between the arrival of puberty and the time of marriage constitutes the overwhelmingly big un-

solved problem of the sexes. What, one may inquire, are the sexes doing with their stirred erotic energies during this enormous interval? Whatever they may be doing in intimate detail, we know very well that in general they are pursuing,—or, if you will, being pursued by,—*casual* sex experience. The old stability has given place to the new instability as the *normal* pattern of the love life. Casualness best expresses the nature of this transvaluation of values.

Marriage used to mean living together until death do us part. Marriage now means living apart until death do bring us together. Marriage no longer binds. Marriage no longer unites. Marriage as a sacred psycho-sexual union conceived in heaven and perpetrated on earth is no longer meaningful to us. The habit of marriage remains. The psychology of marriage has petered out. The custom of marriage is still with us. The familiar wistful sanctions of marriage are now a chapter in antiquarian lore. The new casual way of sexing has modified all our traditional thinking on the subject of holy matrimony.

We might put it this way and say that we have moved from an overvaluation to an undervaluation of the significance of the sex act. Even today there is a considerable body of religious and inspired opinion (which has its fountain head in the cult of the holy virgin) in favor of the chastity of marriage, i.e., the practice of abstinence except for those brief luminous moments when conception is being sweetly perpetrated. Sex at the service of reproduction, and for the rest of the time, religiously out of service. This point of view is what I allude to as overvaluation. Now we have moved, pendulum-like, to the other extreme. Reproduction has become a

mere episode in the relations of the sexes. Procreation is not taken too seriously. But recreation in the sex life has been elevated to the status of a religion. This is what I referred to as undervaluation. The very casualness of modern sex life (we are only witnessing the first fevered beginnings of the new morality) makes for a kind of repudiation of the entire ethics and philosophy of procreation.

Family life as such is on the wane. Instability of marital ties is the outstanding fact. Infidelity is no longer deemed a violation of a sacred vow. A kind of loosening of the old erotic bonds is occurring among all strata of the population, among young and old, good and bad, male and female. This loosening of the old erotic bonds is what is technically called, the new morality. The new morality is really new in the original sense that it assigns a status of reasonable reputability to behavior branded throughout the moralistic Christian centuries as immoral, disreputable: for example, auto-erotism, adultery, easy divorce, promiscuity, homosexual affection, casualness in the love life.

Casualness in the sex relation condenses it into such a simple, straightforward, unmysterious, candid, mechanistic and transitory experience that the vogue of sexual stimulation is inevitable.

What we witness in the history of thought, as our instruments of analysis and precision become more subtle, is the differentiation of unity into variety, the dismemberment of a reality into a number of realities. This pluralistic tendency in analytic thought has recently affected our most intimate conceptions of life, revealing a richness of possibility which had been hidden from sight when we gazed too steadfastly at unity, whole-

ness, concepts in their unanalyzed totality. For example, in thinking of love we dwelt upon its universal quality, unaware of the varieties and levels, so to speak, that may dwell together within that original context. Only of late, as an echo of the Freudian candor in matters sexual, have psychologists found the courage to separate out from among the several ingredients the very significant element of lust. Thus in dynamic textbooks on psychology you will find lust as the term most appropriate for the quintessential attribute of love. In due time, a more perfect analysis will have been completed revealing other vital components in that once mystic conception of sex attraction romantically alluded to as love.

If we apply this analytic dismemberment to the love of the sexes, we shall discover an interesting difference between marital love and sexual love. Under the older morality, the only honorable love was what I have called, marital love. The sexual revolution, transpiring in our very midst, has ruthlessly analyzed out the truth about marital love and discovered that its characteristic attribute is compassion. On the other hand, the essence of sexual love resides in its passion. Under the new morality, sanctions are fast being built up for sexual love that are competing very favorably with the traditional sanctions woven about marital love. A marvelous keen rivalry now exists between these two kinds of love. Such a telltale title as "Married Love," which Marie Stopes wisely gives to her enlightening book, gives the secret away. The secret that marital love, whatever its title to honor, loyalty, self-sacrifice, chivalry, compassion, must not be confounded with that less reputable and more volcanic kind of sex attraction known as sexual love. "Married love" is a fine phrase for the splendidly

new experiment in equating the magic turbulent passion of sex love with the responsible and dignified status of marriage. Can marriage give passion the lease of life it hungers for?

Many psychoanalytical studies demonstrate with a shocking clarity how marital disharmony may be linked with the absence or petering out of sexual love. In a sense never before dreamed of by the evasive and shame-ridden minds of men (and women!), marriage is coming to be construed as an empty ceremonial, sheer futile make-believe, unless buoyed up by the inspiration and stimulation of great passion. Under the older morality, the very mention of making love to one's wife as one might to a secret mistress seemed an unclean and shameful notion. Under the newer morality, the one disreputable behavior will be the denial to one's wife of audacious passion, once looked down upon as fit only for the "painted disasters of the street." Well, the astonishing fact is that our wives and sisters and daughters and sweethearts (a most respectable crew), have all taken to emulating and rivaling the said painted disasters of the street. And why this unseemly haste to model themselves after the pattern of the quondam disreputable daughters of joy? Because they have come to the realization of the quickening uses to which passion can be put. Thus, we witness incredible changes in personal deportment which defy explanation unless we are equipped with enough sympathy and wisdom to appreciate how desperately men and women are trying to save marriage by galvanizing it into a new lease of life by sexualizing it. Latter-day disreputability is merely a crude expression of a wonderful impulse on the part of our respectable females: to win for themselves the spon-

taneous passionate loyalty of men by weaning them from the moralistic absurdity that wives are too good for passion. As Freud sagely remarks: "We can prove to society mathematically that its code of ethics has exacted more sacrifices than it is worth, and that its procedure rests neither on veracity nor wisdom."

Owing to the penetrating discoveries of the psychoanalysts, we have been compelled to undergo a crisis in our lives which really marks the evolution of a mind from an infantile to a mature stage. The most powerful force in our human nature that makes for maturity is sex expression. We are gradually unlearning the abysmal superstitious dogmas of puritanic prudery, and with a surprising rapidity learning to live by the clarifying and courageous insights of a psychoanalytic philosophy of love. In the life of the sexes the beginning of wisdom is to cast out shame. There is in candor, scientifically illuminated, a dignity that is immeasurably superior in spiritual power to the moralistic shame that has served so poorly the deep human needs of men and women, ignorant of how to love one another bravely, beautifully.

The Freudian emphasis on sex, for all its exaggeration and grotesquerie, is one of the most wholesome contributions ever made to the liberation of the mind from the bondage of shame and fear.

"I cannot understand why Wisdom, which is, so to speak, the sediment of everyday experiences, should be denied admission among the acquisitions of knowledge." One must agree with the great Freud that wisdom is the most perfect fruit of knowledge.

## Chapter III

# THE RÔLE OF INFERIORITY IN HUMAN BEHAVIOR

It is doubtful if any phase of life, especially of human life, is free from the taint of insecurity. The helplessness of homo is perhaps the largest fact in history. Out of his sense of impotence he has constructed weird compensatory religions, grotesque metaphysics to piece out the imperfection of things, and literature as consolation and escape from the disproportionate burden of a reality to which his frightened spirit was not equal.

By the crude mythology of religion impotent man sought, by the hocus-pocus of prayer and pull, to cajole omnipotence into sharing godliness with him. Hence the ineradicable infantile longing of man to be godlike. By the subtle mythology of metaphysics, he strove by complicated dialectical nonsense to persuade himself that all was well in the worst of all possible worlds and that somehow evil is absorbed into an ocean of good, ultimately dissolved there.

Literature (and this applies with equal validity to poetry, drama, music, art in general) from time immemorial has been a spiritual soothing syrup, a balm, an anodyne, a fairy-tale, sheer pretence and make-believe bravely set against the stern realities which the cowardly mind of man could not endure.

It is difficult to think of any construction of the human mind which has not in some vital sense been a projection

of man's will-to-superiority, the mythical compensation for a deeply felt inadequacy.

Cosmically, we may say that the world was too much for the mind of man and but one road of escape led promisingly from out the wilderness of his consciousness of inferiority: the road leading to the gracious land of make-believe and sweet mythology.

The helplessness of homo is perhaps the largest fact in history.

Men pursue truth, and to what high purpose? Are they lovers of enlightenment? Does truth bring them inspiration? Is the truth so generously praised because it is the great liberator? Perhaps. What is superabundantly clear is the cunning use to which truth is put by competitive and scheming men who are forever in search of highfalutin justifications of their petty and ignoble intentions. Truth is a weapon in the struggle for power, profit, and prestige. Truth is that abuse of knowledge by which since the dawn of critical thinking men have elevated their status in the world. Truth as illusion is worshipped by men. Truth as disillusion is despised. Why, you may ask, do men even pretend to love truth when their lives are so transparently a lie? Men pretend to love truth because it adds to their prestige, among pretenders, to do so. If you have any doubt about the infinite dishonesty of the human mind, its hatred of the truth, simply recall the painful and never-ending conflict between the great disillusioned skeptics and the small illusioned credulous folk. These little lovers of the truth never hesitate to crucify Christ or to give hemlock to Socrates or to burn at the stake Giordano Bruno or to shoot Francisco Ferrer when the fierce light of truth shines in upon their dark and duplicitous

human natures, revealing in many a nasty corner nothing but infamy and untruth. Who loves the truth? We love the power and the prestige and the glory that truth in due time confers upon those who manipulate its pretences for purposes of self-glorification and ego-fulfillment. The truth? Men do not love truth. They are too inferior for that consecration. What they urgently need and desire is the bolstering up of their inadequate human nature which truth is able to provide in the mean struggle of liars for competitive and exclusive advantages.

Truth is a subtle weapon inferior men use in their crooked attempts to cancel out the consciousness of inferiority.

The universal significance of inferiority and the compensatory behavior of the will-to-power is predicated on the psychological fact of fear. It is astonishing that no historian has had sufficient knowledge of psychopathology to give us a history of man in terms of the so-called instinct of fear. No doubt, one of these psychiatric days, a brilliant pathologist of culture will write us a deep book full of penetrating insight into homo's irrational behavior and sadistic misbehavior in terms of fear. The psychology of fear underlies the whole intricate problem of the rôle of inferiority in life.

What is it man fears? Primarily, death. He cannot endure the thought of extinction. Hence his childish discovery of immortality. Hence his respect for expiation, atonement, forgiveness. There is no functioning religion which has not at its root the uncanny fear of death. Man fears not only death. He fears, with an equal though more strange intensity, life. His fear of life evidences itself in such symptomatic behavior as the congenial de-

sire to play the kill-joy; to trample with unimaginative feet upon the lovely dreams of erratic youth; to employ in and out of season the weapons of envy and hate and malice, pathologic defences against whatever is fine and superior in the world. Ancestor worship, the sickly rule of the elders whether in primitive or in civilized tribes, the insatiable dominance of the grave, the avid hand of death that rules our living life, the pompous ceremony of funerals, the fierce and unremitting hostility between crabbed age and youth, the shameful power of morality to asphyxiate spontaneous impulse, the institutionalization of human impulse culminating in rote and ritual (those blind assassins of life),—what are these but so many inhuman efforts, all too congenial to frightened human nature, to hold in leash that beautiful eagerness of life which the intimidated soul of man cannot abide.

The ritual of fear has embodied itself in such noble and soul-destroying conceptions as God, Fate, Death, Immortality, Evil, Confessional, Prayer, Magic. By a myriad subtle devices man has sought to cleanse his human nature of its infinite pettiness and mean inferiority by postulating spiritual sawdust twins, such as the holy ghost and the holy virgin or God and Jesus, to scrub away the dung of his mortality. The misery of man has resided in his grotesque fear of death and in his even more incredible fear of life. He has projected out these weird infantile fears upon inscrutable powers supposedly at work in the universe for his undoing unless periodically placated. The greater part of human life has been pathetically squandered in quaint ceremonial and silly serious techniques for shooing away the evil spirits, for invoking the intimate blessing of the good spirits. Man's mind is haunted by spooks.

If we glance at the rôle of helplessness in more mundane concerns, we discover the horrid invention of clannishness, tribalism, provincialism, nationalism, all as props for the wobbly ego of man, ill at ease in an uncontrollable universe, scheming to fix in a manageable pattern the unbearable flux of things, employing every imaginable, and a few unimaginable, devices for creating at least the simulacrum of security in a world guaranteeing neither certitude nor peace.

> And we are here as on a darkling plain,
> Swept by confused alarms of struggle and flight,
> Where ignorant armies clash by night.

What a drunken release of his ego does man experience when he can croak about "my country"! What a strange and chemical change comes over his sense of inferiority when he can imagine himself a citizen of a vast sprawling empire. To piece out the congenital imperfection of his egocentric human nature, man commits every manner of indecency to achieve a sense of superiority, of uniqueness, of differentiation. Nature, that dirty begetter of inferior men, has provided many a radiant opportunity for self-glorification by letting loose in the world shallow differences of stature, color, competence, locality, desire, which are then translated from a lowly status of mere accident to the lordly status of sheer destiny: men contriving by hook or crook to exploit these empty differences in behalf of the will-to-superiority.

The superior-inferior relationship has done an illimitable harm to the sons of men. The cunning bully the credulous. The clever cheat the stupid. The powerful exploit the weak. The callous lord it over the sensitive. Superiority has almost always meant superiority in works

of evil. The great murderers of the race are held in highest esteem. Power exerts over the inferior mind of man an evil magic that no psychology can yet adequately explain. The sense of inferiority must pervade human nature even more completely and profoundly than the keen psychiatrists are aware. The admiration of great philosophers is not due primarily to an appreciation of their philosophical-mindedness but rather of their superiority. Somehow the inadequate mind of man must supplement its impotence by a lavish and insanely exaggerated devotion to greatness as power. What is the quintessence of this respect for power?

The hierarchical tendency in human nature deserves some study. Every society that man has built, every religion that he has honored, every system of ethics that he has bowed to, all reveal the vast dominance over the thinking of man of this hierarchical tendency. It is as though the literal reality of dramatic contrasts in nature at large has been accepted as the scriptural pattern of his faith in human values. The day-and-night antithesis appears to be the model for his familiar ways of believing and evaluating. The melodramatic logic of heaven-and-hell fascinates his childish mind. He finally constructs a universe of discourse in which he modestly awards deification to himself and his favorites, and damnation to the other fellow's self and his favorites. Self-glorification is the goal of his striving. He therefore links his ego-destiny with those more mighty egotists who capture his allegiance by giving his personal ego the status of a cosmic force. Hence the ancient tendency (which may never disappear out of human life) to that hierarchy of loyalties by means of which he expands his ego by two antithetical behaviors: he lords it over all

and sundry whom he can look upon as inferior because of the accidents of color, locality, status; while, on the other hand, he rather good-naturedly acknowledges as his legitimate superiors those persons who can help him to share in the blessings of power-profit-and-prestige. A remarkable bargain which homo drives with Mephistopheles and perennially celebrates as good. Inferiority and superiority are not such strange bedfellows after all.

The psychology of human behavior may be summed up pithily as follows: deification for me, damnation for thee.

The relation of the sexes is most enlightening when gauged by the logic of inferiority. It is astonishing to what a large extent conduct seemingly motivated by the sex drive is in reality fundamentally motivated by the ego drive. Woman's humiliation in marriage throughout the man-made centuries has been more profoundly a consequence of ego frustration than sex inadequacy. Whatever infelicities she may have suffered because of the violation of sexual etiquette may reasonably be construed as tolerable by the side of the acid frustration of her personality. The ego is more pervasive as a human reality than sex. Human natures that harmonize on the ego level can contrive to put up with sex disharmony; but sex harmony can not cope with the problem of disharmony rooting in a maladjustment of egos. The Adlerian theme runs deeper in human life than the Freudian, though the latter, because of its dramatic and sensational components, gives the impression of being the more fundamental. Perhaps the most complete insight into the disharmonies of human nature would generously take an equal cognizance of the rôles of the ego and the

sex drives, since, in botched reality, the two overlap and interpenetrate.

Male usage is interesting. Men speak of their conquests (not of themselves, of course) of the female of the species. Ego satisfaction in sex adventure has wider repercussions in self-esteem than the unadorned erotic experience. Don Juan may be exercising his ample libido in pursuing ladies of high and low degree; what is quite certain is that he is achieving ego expansion through his sex exploits. So, it is intelligent to reason that our newly liberated young women, in hectic quest of sex love, are in sober truth merely proving to themselves and the mocking male universe how grown-up they are, how mature and self-determining their emancipated egos are. The overcoming of inferior status is a better explanation of many typically sexual phenomena than is any assumption sprung from libido speculations. Men and women are forever preoccupied with the problem of achieving adequacy, or, if you like, the dominance sanctioned by the all-too-human will-to-power.

Imagine a situation (not very remote, dear reader) in which the women of the race monopolize all the controlling positions while the men are kept at home in competent charge of the sweet domestic drudgeries that for so many heart-breaking centuries have kept women in sacred bondage to fecundity and fatigue. What would be the effect of this swapping of ego-dominances upon the sexual life of male and female? Which would be the more ramifying reality: sex or ego?

Life has been moving toward an equality of the sexes, that is, an equalization of their egos. In truth, one of the most difficult problems in our new world springs from a disharmony of the sexes due to the emancipation of

woman from servile dependence upon man. Thus it is important to realize that the sex war is fundamentally not a conflict centering around sexuality but about egotism. The disharmony of the sexes, which grows apace, is a maladjustment of sensitive and touchy egos. The great sex problem of our perturbed times is a problem in human nature. The tendency of certain stereotyped psychoanalysts to speak of sex as if it were an overwhelming reality in itself, divorced from the larger setting of human nature and personality, does violence to the truth about the subordination of sex to ego-dominance.

We get more light on the primacy of the ego (the vital nucleus of human personality) if we examine the period of childhood which may accurately be styled the period of helplessness. Whether we survey the childhood of an individual or the childhood of the race, we observe the vast rôle of the sense of inadequacy,—the source of the "inferiority complex,"—with its supplementary technique for compensation: witness the prevalence of magic, fairy-tale, illimitable self-importance expressing itself through reverie and dream and theatrical make-believe and mythology, the whole fascinating procedure of negating inferiority by mock-heroic assumptions and poses of grandiose superiority. The consciousness of inferiority makes man (a mere over-grown child) the humorless strutting bully that he is. There is a certain pathos in man's never-resting attempts to rise superior to his true self which haunts him because it is so woefully inadequate.

It is not only specific organic inferiority that infects the human soul with an uneasy consciousness of inadequacy, giving still-birth to compensatory wish fulfilments

and excessive ego yearnings. Ibsen's poignant drama "Little Eyolf" is a remarkable instance of organic inferiority in a child seeking mythical compensations in heroic imaginings: the cripple seeking solace and fulfilment in the soldier. May we not boldly surmise that the human race (which Nietzsche accurately described as "botched") has been a cripple, intellectually, emotionally, spiritually, seeking desperate solace in crack-brained egotisms and strutting soldierly poses, the mocking compensation for deeply sensed inadequacy?

If organic imperfection is a fertile source of malaise and morbid adjustment to reality, what shall we say of those functional inadequacies that mar human nature in ways often too subtle for the new psychology to unravel? At all costs, we labor under a mighty compulsion to make a good showing in the universe, to play our absurd little parts on the overcrowded stage of life with gusto and large rhetorical effectiveness, to win the applause of a world that enjoys nothing so much as humiliating and degrading and putting us in our proper place. If the mind of the simplest of men could be translated in all its raving minuteness, nothing relevant or irrelevant being omitted from this psychopathologic report, we should have before us the most lurid evidence of the insane limits to which even a commonplace mind can yearn in its aching desire to achieve significance. To achieve significance! That's the be-all and end-all of human yearning among a race of humans who are pledged to do every incredible thing in their power to keep their fellow men from being unique. The search for distinction, the quest for prestige, the desire for dominance run very deep in human nature. How shall we ever build a real fellowship on the basis of such narcissistic human nature?

The evolution of behavior is in the direction of humanism. Before humanism is attained, human conduct is caught in the compulsions of two other modes of responding to the social milieu: narcissism and egotism. By narcissism we need simply understand a mode of behaving that begins and ends within the magic matrix of the self. By egotism we may envisage a kind of socialized narcissism, that is, narcissistic or self-adoring tendencies confronting some of the demands of objective reality and finding it necessary to make their peace with that larger universe of interrelated selves. Thus, in an historical view, it is legitimate to say that women in general have lived within a narcissistic universe, while men in general have been compelled to transcend at least the more infantile aspects of narcissism (self-adoration) in favor of a reasonable and realistic adjustment to a world of interacting egos. Men have been the great egotists; women have been the grand narcissists. Narcissism, played upon by the forces of socialization, yields gradually to egotism. Egotism, influenced by socialization, expands itself until it merges into humanism. What we witness in our feministic age is the emancipation of woman from the infantile status of narcissism to the quasi-mature status of egotism. Simultaneously, man's crude and provincial egotism is being humanized. The sexes will not know the beauty of inner harmony or of comradely affection until both will have been profoundly humanized. Humanization means dedication to ends that transcend the stuffy limits of self-adoration and of self-glorification. The salvation of life resides in the universal triumph of humanism.

Narcissistic behavior is an infantile compensation for an inner sense of inadequacy. The vast amount of

"touchiness" among girls is too familiar a fact to need dwelling upon. Egotism is defensive also, but more vigorously and openmindedly so than narcissism. In either event we are dealing with a failure in human nature, a failure on the part of the total personality to make peace with its egocentric limitations that war upon the larger adjustments to life. Even the profoundly humanized ego, attaining to the heights of spirituality, cannot slough off the ancient residuals of narcissism and egotism which belong inextricably in the evolution of human personality.

The omnipresent and apparently insoluble problems of racial antagonism, color line, class cleavage, language barrier, levels of status, cultural differences, are all of them complicated by the presence of psychopathologic limitations of human nature that can be tersely expressed in the concepts of narcissism and egotism. Though no one with a sense for the realistic can deny the powerful ingredients of economic and social factors in these world-wide problems, it is of the essence of enlightenment to appreciate the psychologic forces that add their great havoc to the situation. No analysis of a social problem can be viewed as satisfactory these psychoanalytic days which ignores the crucial relevancy of twists and blind spots in human nature.

Why does the Catholic hate the Protestant? Why do Christian institutions of learning bar the Jew? Why does the white man despise the black man? Why do the rich feel superior to the poor? Why does an ignoramus enjoy jokes about the highbrow? Why does a Puritan find a special zest in tormenting a Hester Prynne? Why do Socialist comrades devote themselves so mercilessly to criticising one another? Why, in short,

is every situation in life made use of to set people off against one another? Though the answer to these questions involves economic and social factors, the ultimate essence lies in certain perversions and pathologies of human nature, say what you will.

The economic and social forces are the solid background, the psychologic and pathologic factors are the subtle foreground of every problem concerning the vital interrelation between human nature and the environment. And the point worth mentioning in this connection is the deep subconscious influence of the rôle of inferiority (on the part of so-called superiors quite as well) in the conflicts and misunderstandings and cleavages of mankind. You need only reflect upon the importance of patriotism in the evolution of social life to realize with a gasp the hideous potency of the sense of inadequacy in the vicious misbehaviors of men—though decades and generations and even centuries of unifying pretenses have seemingly knit them into a genuine fellowship of mutually tolerant humans. Catholics do not object to murdering their fellow-Catholics in a properly patriotic war. Why not?

Though my mind leans heavily toward economic and sociologic interpretations of human conflict on the grand scale (such as the dirty wars of capitalist-imperialisms), I am more and more convinced of the sheer inexplicableness of these startling events, that recur too often in human history to be accounted for merely by a logic of external compulsion, unless we call to our aid the illuminating hypotheses and "mechanisms" of psychopathology. Only the new psychiatry can really help us to understand why human nature behaves as irrationally as it does. There are powerful *internal* compulsions about

which economic determinism has little to say since its whole emphasis is upon the more tangible, the more graphic and seemingly important, external compulsions. A knowledge of the overlapping and interlacing of the two kinds of compulsion will afford us a more brilliant and a more helpful insight into man's life on earth. Psychiatry to the rescue!

The psychopathology of war involves the rôle of inferiority with its compensatory mechanism of ego-glorification on a scale so large and vivid as to leave no doubts concerning its vast importance. The sudden elevation to special status of men who were of no particular consequence in civil life is a fact full of significant implications for the understanding of the eagerness of men to participate in war at all. Nor must we underrate the accession of ego-dominance which women enjoy in seeing their men off to war and thrilling with an irrational pride at the general ceremonial hocus-pocus of the patriotic enterprise. Andreas Latzko has dramatized this reality in a penetrating chapter in his well-known book, "Men in War". Woman, like man, is under compulsions, both private and social, to seek an inflated compensatory status for felt inadequacies, in pathologic form, if a more normal outlet is absent,—as it is too frequently in the daily round of uninspired routine. War, hellish as it is, is astonishingly congenial to the make-believe nature of humans who seek at all costs to expand their egos, though in the sequel they are driven to pay the unspeakable penalty of mutilation or even death.

The hierarchical tendency in human nature is beautifully illustrated in the war venture. Something in men is deeply satisfied when they are able to vent their omnipresent hostility by making a scapegoat of someone, alien

or subordinate, and when the deep-rooted impulse to subservience is appeased by having to bow down to vested superiors. This dualism in human nature, the impulse to worship and the impulse to degrade, underlies a vast amount of irrationality otherwise inexplicable. War more richly than any other human experience caters to and strangely appeases this duality of desire. The most fruitful approach to human irrationality lies in a study of human vanity. Vanity is inferiority adoring itself unseemly. Westermarck writes: "There are people destitute of almost everything which we regard as necessaries of life, but there is no people so rude as not to take pleasure in ornaments. The ancient barbarians who inhabited the South of Europe at the same time as the reindeer and the mammoth brought to their caves brilliant and ornamental objects. The women of the utterly wretched Veddahs in Ceylon decorate themselves with necklaces of brass heads. The Fuegians are 'content to be naked, but ambitious to be fine.' "

The worker whose wages do not amount to a row of beans finds nothing ludicrous or strange in his speaking enthusiastically of "my firm". The inconsequential citizen speaks of "my country" as if there were any sense or truth in that possessive pose. Servants look upon their mistresses with a queer sense of awe. Everyone is perfectly willing and happy to shine by reflected glory. This quaint parasitism characterizes human nature, constituting the chief obstacle in the way of genuine liberation, honest self-regard. We can hardly doubt that at the root of this inherent subservience of man nestles the feeling of inferiority. The feeling of inferiority achieves its neutralization in setting up and worshiping idols of superiority; hence the almost impossible cultivation of a

decent equality among men. Equality is what competitive humans are always croaking about and always making impossible by their fetishistic attachment to the superior-inferior conception of reality. Equality is really too humble and therefore too "unnatural" an achievement for men whose history indicates every manner of irrational mutilation of the self in behalf of compensatory loyalties that somehow promise either forgetfulness of self or its transcendence in a larger self. Are humans so constituted as to require idols to worship forevermore? Only an analysis of the inferiority complex can help us to frame an adequate answer. . . .

What lingers longest in memory is the sting of humiliation. The wounds to our ego-regard remain unhealed whatever noble attempts our pretenses make to forget and forgive. Out of the half-repressed depths of the troubled mind, at the slightest kindred provocation, leap the ghosts of memories never laid to rest because the humiliation of the ego is literally beyond endurance. Shame attaching to sex experience does not work as insidious a havoc to our total personality as does the wreckage of self-esteem incited by the smarts and pains of humiliation.

The most persistent of our internal compulsions is the compulsion to come out on top! One key to human conflict is this pleasurable primitive impulse to lord it over our fellows. We use the weapons of power, profit, prestige, and prejudice, to establish and hold fast to whatever status promises the ego-satisfaction of being superior to our fellow-men. If one inquires why there is this restless itch to outdo and outwit and outclass the other fellow, we straightway are up against the problem of the "inferiority complex". Man is crammed full of

imperfections and inadequacies. He is also victimized by self-love and self-glorification. His perplexing problem is to build himself a world in which self-glorification is so definitely assured that his self-love can proceed with complaisance to "forget" the myriad limitations and inferiorities that truly constitute his human nature. Man is never perfectly sure of his superiority for the very good reason that a world of critics and deriders take a malicious joy in reminding him (at the most inopportune moments) of his limitations. Whatever passes for humor, whatever goes by the name of cruelty, can be the better understood by reference to this haunting sense of inadequacy that cries out for sheer forgetting, for the mercy of tolerance, for the solace of compensatory will-to-power. The pathos of homo is his playing at godliness.

Consider for a moment the kinds of experience that may be painful stimulators of the sense of inadequacy. Lack of beauty, lack of stature, lack of charm, lack of language ability, lack of money, lack of culture, failure in love, failure in work, failure in examination, failure in competitive sports, failure in heroism, shame, foolishness, stupidity, awkwardness, childishness, fear, error,—and a thousand other profoundly trivial irritants and excitants of "personality-deficit".

The incorrigible human impulse to form clubs, secret fraternities, masonries, cliques, clans, ghettoes, takes its origin in the feeling of inferiority. These unblest mediocrities have but one way of escape out of the crushing consciousness of insignificance: the way of the herd. When a multitude of nonentities pool their interests, they somehow gain a sense of individual significance denied them, in the premises, by God. The prejudice of

an individual is provincialism; the prejudice of a nation is patriotism. There is a strange chemistry in herd behavior which has not yet been adequately explained. Mutual admiration must have a stimulating power which only those bound by ties of exclusiveness can properly appreciate. Somehow this habit of clubbing, a stimulator of the sense of exclusiveness, the creator of magic loyalties, releases and expands the human ego by permitting wide extensions to the human desire for self-importance. The badges, the honors, the distinctions, the hierarchy of status, the special ceremonials, the expansive hocus-pocus and the delightful infantile fairy-tale tomfoolery, what are these silly exhibitionisms but evidences of the mad human longing for a self-importance originally denied by God, Nature, Fate, Heredity, Reality?

Well, then, be it humbly admitted that the world is full of nincompoops under a weird compulsion to play at being Gods. Half the cruelty of man's inhumanity to man (and to woman), is explicable in terms of that unbearable personal inadequacy which must at all costs be screened from self-consciousness by the development of mutually exclusive loyalties that feed this impulse to differentiation. This deep impulse to differentiation exists because human beings have no other psychological means at their disposal for attaining the status of self-importance. Hate is the most universal dramatic means of setting people off from one another with the satisfying consequence that they can feel superior to all those whom they hate.

Why is it that of all persons the one whom we are all in a conspiracy to shut up is the critic? Why do we fear the critical-minded person? In every hinterland there is a little Socrates who plays the gadfly to his bourgeois

compatriots. If he can contrive to hide his skeptic utterance in a parable or in clownish humor or in a subtly innocent fairy tale, he may escape the pillory of public hostility. Voltaire, Swift, Cervantes, Rabelais, France, Shaw, Mark Twain, have escaped literal execution by the protective device of pretending to utter the most gracious and charming and witty and human of truths while actually committing marvelous murder upon their incorrigibly stupid and queer fellow-men. If we cannot endure the keen-tongued remarks of the critical-minded (themselves compensating for painful defect, physical or sexual or emotional), the reason is not far to seek: we cannot endure the exposé of our imperfections. The half-hidden knowledge of our inferiority haunts us like a doom.

If we scan the history of culture in America we discover a most perfect example of the rôle of the inferiority-complex in human behavior. The pioneer consecrated himself to the dreary necessitous task of coaxing a livelihood from a reluctant land. His devotion to getting-on was his true religion. Whatever human impulse threatened to undermine his frenzied concentration upon the immediate task, was quickly inhibited as a thing of evil. His puritanism was a religious cloak for his commercialism. His kill-joy attitude toward the life of the senses was the inevitable by-product of his tough bargain with reality. He essayed to cancel beauty from the minds of men because to his narrowly-centered mind beauty was a harlot; only duty was respectable. His sense of the emptiness of his life he shrewdly hid from contemplation, covering up his deep inadequacy with a ritual of make-believe by which he sought to convince

himself of the superiority and magnificence of his hard-won, unique status.

The industrialist, the psychological blood-brother of the pioneer, carried this logic of superiority and magnificence to its farthest reach of braggartism until he finally persuaded the whole world to believe in America as the land of golden promise where paupers might be presidents and salesmen trustees of the higher learning. The low-brow came triumphantly into his own, deliciously imagining himself a new species, apart from and radiantly superior to a mere man of learning, the despised high-brow. What the industrialist lacked in qualitative significance, he overcompensated for in quantitative magnificence. In the deeps of his troubled mind, knowing himself an ignoramus and a cheat, he built up a wonderful network of defences along the lines of rationalization and self-delusion by which he actually succeeded in fooling himself and his fellows into believing that the vision of the good life had at last been realized in the kingdom of the ungodly, in the religion of money-theism. A sense of inferiority was rarely absent from his megalomaniacal mind. He shouted his success from the housetops because he was in the depths of him a rotten failure.

Our literary men, themselves puny pawns on the chess-board of reality, were the wistful spokesmen of this pathologic cleavage in American life. They honored culture but managed to keep a sharp eye on cash. They loved irony but contented themselves with peddling vaudeville humor. They worshipped beauty and yet felt a tender respect for mere magnificence. They believed in truth but were ashamed not to be good fellows. Our men of genius were victims of a gnawing sense of in-

feriority, of personal and cultural inadequacy. There is no chapter in history so fascinating as this one concerning the rôle of the inferiority complex in American culture.

In the field of the psychoneuroses (which can most simply be defined as maladjustments of the personality involving ego-frustration and sex conflict) we discover a wide variety of cases rooting in the feeling of inferiority. The typical instance is that of the organically defective child hiding its painful sense of imperfection in awkward behaviors such as shyness, embarrassment, stammering, reticence, reverie, silly braggartism, fantastic imaginings clustering around self-importance, detestation of those of superior endowment, envy, self-pity, self-indulgence. The most typical of the functional cases is the proverbial spoiled child. Tantrums, negativism, unreasonableness, self-love, possessiveness, emotional instability, flight from difficulty, tears, are among the well-known behavior symptoms that characterize the young psychoneurotic. In mature men and women we observe the tenacious persistence of habit residuals the origin of which goes back to the spoiled-child period.

One of the most valuable technics developed by Alfred Adler and his school for the 'cure' of feelings of inferiority lies in the inculcation of a new courage, a new clarity, a new confidence consequent upon a sympathetic analysis of the person's life history revealing those evasions of social responsibility and failures of human adjustment, giving rise to the sense of inadequacy which finally culminates in ego-frustration, personal humiliation, a sense of incapacity. This therapeutic technic is of the utmost significance in bolstering up the confidence and security of children; hence, its enormous importance

for the new education. This new "educational psychiatry" promises wonderfully for the reëducation of the sexes.

In studying sex let us not forget its indissoluble relation to the underlying human problem of inferiority.

Take the contemporary situation in liberated sex behavior. As a proposition in logic, reasonable-minded men can't help admitting that the right of women to self-determining sex experience is a prerogative beyond challenge. The proposition is all the more plausible because of man's long experience in promiscuity sanctioned by his will-to-power, his philosophy of passion, his pursuit of pleasure as a great goal in life. As a logician he discovers no violation of his major or minor premises in the similar sexual promiscuity of the female of the species. But logic is not life. In complicated reality, as a creature of psychological dispositions and habits and regards, he cannot so simply accept woman's perfectly logical claim to behaving as indiscriminately as she pleases either before or after marriage. Superficially, one could construe these disharmonies as springing from a specifically sexual situation. Nothing could be farther from the facts in the case.

The crux of the difficulty lies in the relation of two assertive egos seeking dominance in a realm where dominance is most perilous. If it is true that man, once bound in marriage to woman, cannot abide the thought of her having given herself freely (as befits an emancipated egocentric female) to other men who pleased her fancy, the reason for the bitter intolerance of her all-too-human past is rooted in man's sense of humiliation,—ego-frustration,—that he should not have had conferred upon him the godly privilege of enjoying "the lovely first

of things" but should have to accept what a courageous and complaining feminist (sexually promiscuous) alluded to as "second-hand goods". Woman is attempting to prove that promiscuity is as natural to her and as appropriate as it is to man. The logic is perfect. Man, baffled and perturbed, enters the psychological rejoinder: my ego, my self-regard, cannot endure the humiliation.

Under the régime of fecundity, woman's primary problem was sexual. Her great need was a technic of contraception. Procreation was her deepest dread. But, under the new régime of prevenception, reproduction being under splendid scientific management, procreation yielding its dark sovereignty to recreation, woman's fundamental problem is not that of sex but of the rights of the ego. Man cannot yet make his peace with the fact that the woman he has chosen to honor in marriage assumes the right to dishonor him at her sweet will and to call this humiliation of his ego, the independence of woman! If the war of the sexes has any meaning, that meaning attaches to woman's uncanny claim to a self-determining personality that (like man's) can do no wrong, sexually. The question for psychopathologists is, can woman play the historic rôle of man, the irresponsible anarch, and continue to be honored by man as a creature evoking tenderness and compassion and adoration?

A very interesting and rather ludicrous instance of the mechanism of compensation fleeing, frightened and maniacal, from the consciousness of inferiority, is observable in the behavior of the married woman who employs every pathological means known to the wise psychiatrist, to run her universe as she sees fit, in pure and unadulterated tyranny. We are all acquainted with these mad

women, before marriage neglected nonentities, after marriage insanely self-centered manipulators of human destiny. Though marriage brings out the lunacy in us all, it puts a staggeringly high premium on that most pestiferous kind of irrationality which motivates the insignificant female whom a chance throw of the dice (misconstrued as the hand of God) has precipitated into marriage, the pathologic playground where she cuts capers of queerest pattern to suit her ego-inflated moods. Marriage is a fascinating study in compensatory behavior offsetting an unbearable sense of personal inadequacy. Marriage is the most complicated of the psychoneuroses.

And what is jealousy, if it be not a reflection of wounded egotism? We speak of sexual jealousy as if the jealousy lay in the behavior called sexual. It is much truer to perceive in jealousy the reaction of a total personality jarred by a realization of a diminution of self-esteem. What really hurts is that our proud and egocentric personalities should have been subjected to a kind of public deflation in which the world is made aware of our not counting for quite as much as we had, in our megalomaniacal innocence, assumed we had every right to count. The violence done to the ego wounds more tormentingly than the pain suffered by sex. A society in which our egos were less private and self-centered would greatly diminish, almost cancel out, the pain of humiliation which we can't help feeling when sexual rivalry has ousted us from our status of primacy and self-importance, thus stirring hideously the black pools of jealousy that feed our self-esteem in a competitive society where the psychology of private property, of indisputable possession, of standing upon one's rights, infects every human relation including, of course, sex and

love. It is therefore reasonable to believe that a highly socialized, a profoundly humanized society would, by its very nature, bring about that revaluation of the private personality in favor of comradeship and communal compassion, by the healing sanity of which the sexual relations of men and women would be less liable to the poison of jealousy, that is, the humiliation of the private ego.

It is doubtful whether human nature, being incorrigibly the frightened and inferior and egocentric bundle of bad habits that it is, will ever be cleansed of jealousy. But that is a far cry from the reasonable belief that a more sincerely socialized and communal order of life will greatly succeed in correcting the violence of private passion (the fertile source of jealousy) with the decent sway of compassion, of comradeship. . . .

If every person who thought of suicide were under a compulsion to perpetrate it, who would be left to write about it? William James has said in his sprightly and penetrating manner that no man could rightly consider himself as educated who had not dallied with thoughts of suicide. In attempting to understand suicidal thoughts and suicidal practices, we can hardly trip upon a theory more in tune with the facts than the Adlerian notion of inferiority.

The mood of depression, the sense of futility, the feeling of failure, the vastness of the unresponding universe looming so large and ominous above our cringing and suffocated ego, the unhappy realization of the gulf between ideal and reality, the gathering compulsion to rid our plagued minds of the torture of life that bears down upon the spirit so oppressively, these suicidal attitudes are most explicable on the assumption of a haunting inadequacy that finally tears the rational mind asunder

leaving an uncontrollable gap where death enters as a merciful healer of so merciless a wound.

No doubt there are obscure distorted tides of pathology that rock the mind in ways not yet clear to scientific analysis. But, surely, the overwhelming sense of personal defeat and ego-humiliation that underlies the mood of suicide, is interlinked with the thoroughly human problem of inferiority. Not necessarily an inferiority as measured by competitive and relativistic standards, but rather a deep-lying and torturing sense of personal inadequacy as viewed by one's own troubled human nature. The ego, wounded and ill at ease and lonely, sits in unhappy judgment upon itself and announces the verdict of: guilty. The feeling of inferiority haunts the human mind like an ancient doom.

"Brief and powerless is Man's life: on him and all his race the slow sure doom falls pitiless and dark. Blind to good and evil, reckless of destruction, omnipotent matter rolls on its relentless way; for Man, condemned today to lose his dearest, to-morrow himself to pass through the gate of darkness, it remains only to cherish, ere yet the blow falls, the lofty thoughts that ennoble his little day; disdaining the coward terrors of the slave of Fate, to worship at the shrine that his own hands have built; undismayed by the empire of chance, to preserve a mind free from the wanton tyranny that rules his outward life; proudly defiant of the irresistible forces that tolerate, for a moment, his knowledge and his condemnation, to sustain alone, a weary but unyielding Atlas, the world that his own ideals have fashioned despite the trampling march of unconscious power."

Thus the most inspiring teacher of modern youth, the marvelous Bertrand Russell.

## Chapter IV

# PSYCHIATRY TO THE RESCUE

We have had several interesting attempts to generalize the meaning of history from one special angle or another. Climate, geography, religion, politics, economics, biology, sociology, psychology, sex, have all played their predominant and prepotent parts in these theorizings. Huntington, Buckle, Kidd, Cramb, Marx, Darwin, Spencer, Nordau, Freud, have contributed significantly to our completer understanding of those complications of human behavior collectively called history. Nor must we fail to mention the enlightening studies of Bagehot, Le-Bon, Shotwell, Robinson, Boas, Veblen, Rivers, Dewey, Angell, Russell, Spengler. For all that, I should like to insist that a profound study of history is yet to be made. It seems increasingly clear that the motives of men (which underlie the meanings of history) cannot be keenly fathomed except by a group of philosophical analysts with an extraordinary equipment in psychopathology, social science, literature, the history of culture. No volume has yet appeared representing this desirable combination of knowledges and abilities. The stress will fall, I believe, on psychopathology. My opinion is that the next great event in the history of human thought will be the reinterpretation of behavior from the angle of a flexible psychopathology.

Whatever field of life we touch, straightway we are in the presence of problems of maladjustment. Whether

we go over the field of criminology, juvenile delinquency, marriage and divorce, business relations, the institutions of the home, the church, the state, the school, or study the intricate taboos and sacred sanctions of ethical codes, or peer into the mob-intricacies of journalism, or specialize in the phenomena of crowd behavior, persistently and inescapably we are in the perturbing presence of problems that can only be approached intelligently from a psychiatric point of view. History, penetratingly conceived, is a branch of psychoanalytic psychiatry.

What a shameful commentary on the low-thoughted bungling inadequacy of civilization that the exquisitely human problems of misbehavior shall be left to the callous mercies of lawyers and judges and policemen and matrons and wardens and politicians: a crew of self-centered unimaginative mediocrities as well equipped for the task of ameliorating human life as pugilists, butchers, and hangmen.

If we humbly acknowledge that our civilization is merely a complicated form of savagery, at best simply the higher barbarism, brutishness wearing an attractive mask of refinement, we shall appreciate the truth that if civilization means anything really worth while, it must reveal a high degree of humanization. Humanization is attested by the general presence in human relations of compassion. Compassion is something nobler than pity or charitable amiability: it is social sympathy illumined by a fairly impersonal sense of justice. You may get a rough estimate of the vileness of a society by noting its major injustices. Our dirty civilization is nurtured by violence, hate, envy, inequality, injustice, legal thuggery, moralistic humbuggery, religious hypocrisy, personal rapacious egotism, a truly troglodyte contempt for what

is sensitive and sincere in human nature. This so-called civilization, which is a pigsty made somewhat habitable by an inordinate use of perfume, lives by callousness and cruelty. The perfumed perfidy of superior brains under this régime of sanctified savagery is the one conspicuous fact with which as sensitive critics of civilization we ought to reckon. Wrongdoing, rationalized into plausible propositions by legalistic and moralistic cunning, fills every nook and cranny of our exploitative civilization.

However great our faith in the environmental determinants of human behavior, in the truly astonishing power of economic and social forces to shape and misshape our lives, we shall be missing an amazing amount of insight if we ignore or minimize the importance of the human nature factors such as the psychoanalysts and the dynamic psychopathologists deal with. How much more light on behavior in society, or in the human family for that matter, do we get if we comprehend the nature of sadism. There is a lurid chapter in the history of human conduct that has very little to do with specific economic determinants but has a great deal to do with certain distortions and perversions resident in human nature. Whatever the form of government, whatever its economic tenets, the amount of inhumanity of which it is capable and too often guilty is a startling evidence of the existence of psychopathologic reality but feebly correlated with the social situation. Take so vast a theme as the human will-to-power. Whatever the form of social organization, whether it be hidebound conservative or hidebound communist, the underlying fact is a truly megalomaniacal pursuit of power. Even when we shall have desperately eliminated from the motives of men the dirty love of profiteering, we shall still be

racking our brains as to how to hold in leash the illimitable desire for power and for prestige.

To perceive in social organization the interplay of human nature and environmental pressure is, in a general way, to be on solid ground theoretically. The difficulties arise when we attempt to partial out the several interrelated factors in the situation, to weigh each one properly, to work out our psychosociological equations for human behavior in any given instance. Bias makes one mind weight overmuch the factors of environmental pressure. Preconception makes another mind weight unduly the factors in human nature. Thus we swing a little drunkenly between the wholesale assumptions of heredity and environment. Fortunately for the sanity of science, these wholesale methods of thinking have been sufficiently under attack by sympathetic critics to yield other alternatives. The recent stress on behavior patterns as determined by childhood episodes has been a most wholesome contribution to a more balanced survey of the entire field of human behavior. Under psychoanalytic and behavioristic guidance, we are being taught to see conduct as a function of the highly specific interrelation between the capability for responsiveness of a young plastic organism *and* the capacity for stimulation of an environment in which persons occupying strategic positions, like parents and teachers and nurses and priests, are the essential determiners of human reaction. In short, environment has been more specifically and locally defined as the shaping power of strategically situated persons whose very opportunities for manipulating human destiny constitute them true social forces. Persons are conceived as forces. This psychologic corrective

of economic doctrine is a first-rate contribution to our enlightenment.

A very important point is the latter-day recognition of the essentially psychologic nature of social concepts. In a loose and wholesale fashion, we are on the right track in speaking of economic and sociological forces. So soon as we try to comprehend these forces in specific detail, we are astonished to find that vague impersonal forces, appearing almost to lie outside of human nature, working their inexorable will like some cosmic doom, are in concrete reality merely complicated clusters of human reactions thoroughly psychological in their texture.

Economic interpretations are both fruitful and brilliant in providing us with broad historical backgrounds for comprehending the complicated flow of events. When our problem is the immediate one of understanding some live institution in our midst, our reliance upon economic and sociological generalization often amounts to nothing more than parrot repetition, intellectual laziness, psychological obtuseness, bad habits of overgeneralization. The ever-present danger is the congenial pastime of oversimplification. Dynamic psychology is an indispensable associate of sound economic theorizing. I know of no way of understanding a live contemporary institution except in terms of its incentives to loyalty on the one hand, and on the other hand, the desires and needs and responses of human beings to those attractive or urgent incentives. Straightway we are in the midst of psychology and psychiatry. At the risk of tedious repetition, let me once more insist that we have finally been provided with keys to reality which promise to open up marvelously new possibilities of making headway in our forever baffled study of human nature.

Take, for example, the problem of religion, involving the durable existence of an institution called the church. Using the economic interpretation of history as a springboard, we can essay a brave leap into impressive generalization to the effect that the church is determined by certain social forces primarily of an economic nature. There is enough truth in this proposition to provide the radicals with dynamite for many a good assault upon entrenched privilege and stagnant parasitic conservatism. Certainly. But having admitted as much, have we really penetrated to the core of religious conviction? I think not. If we annihilated all the churches in the world as churches (that might prove to be the basis of the profoundest of intellectual revolutions), could we say with psychological assurance that we had destroyed the ancient need of man to seek those consolations and infantile guarantees and spiritual props for his deep sense of inferiority which the historic churches have apparently provided?

In atheistical Russia we observe a fairly successful attempt to undermine the authority of the church as a tangible institution conducting certain sacred ceremonials under formalistic auspices. Superficially one might argue that the traditional church in Russia has been rendered powerless by the fierce negations of proletarian skepticism and agnosticism. Is it really so? Speaking psychologically, have the masses of humble Russians performed in so short a time the intellectual miracle of substituting critical-mindedness for the superstitious cult of credulity? To state the question is to hint at the answer. What we find is the old reverential vitality of religious impulse seeking new embodiment in the religion of Leninism. Lenin has been canonized.

Lenin is a saint (in Russia). The credulous little people of that great land light sanctimonious candles to that revered saint, come in droves to kneel and worship at his perpetual bier. Has the illimitable human capacity for credulity, dependence, self-stultification, in other words, for superstitious worship, been washed out of the brain of those believing masses?

The problem is always deeper than social forces. It is as deep as human nature. Human nature reveals a capacity for irrationality that outlives the rule of economic and social stratification. Only dynamic psychiatry can make plain and plausible these distorted and delinquent habit-residuals in human behavior, traceable in significant part to the omnipotence of fear in the heart of man, the omnipresence of credulity in the mind of man. The one abiding question for those who love wisdom more than anything else on earth is this: how shall we inculcate in a new race of men a genuine, all-pervading love of critical-mindedness? No one need waste any time thinking himself intelligent about life or human society who has not wrestled with this fundamental problem in the science and art of reëducation.

Take such fascinating problems in the new psychology as these: What is the relation between the social philosophy of Jesus and his personal sexual situation? What is the relation between the fact that Saint Paul was an epileptic and various of his doctrines? To what extent did the psychoneurotic and psychotic afflictions of men like Cæsar, Napoleon, Kaiser Wilhelm, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, affect what men call history? How much of the torture inflicted upon young boys and girls by hard-hearted priests and parents and pedagogues is traceable to sexual disharmony and to ego-

frustration? To how large an extent is puritanism a psychopathologic phenomenon?

Even admitting that the economic conflicts of capitalistic and imperialistic cliques for the hogging of the world's resources are the graphic, realistic cause of modern wars, how can we explain (in terms of purely economic interpretation) the willingness of millions of men in all lands to go and get themselves shot to smithereens in a trader's war which cannot possibly promise any good outcome for them? We might put it this way: capitalists precipitate wars for economic reasons; proletarians go to war for psychologic reasons,—such as fear, delusion, pride, glory, adventure, sex experience, ego expansion, sadism, compulsion. The economics of war are important beyond measure but the psychopathology of war is infinitely more important for all of us to reckon with. The realities of human nature are fundamental, in the baffling sense that they are forever vividly present challenging us to understand and to direct them sanely.

How are we to understand a nation, a people? The economic facts are writ so large as to be beyond neglect these palpably materialistic days. But the psychologic facts are not equally obvious precisely because we have not yet been trained to construe reality so intimately, so subtly. Even if it be true that the attitude of the whites toward the blacks in America is powerfully determined by a history of human relations in which economic forces were vitally important, no one who is gifted with psychological-mindedness can content himself with that broad and loose-limbed explanation as really satisfying. Economic rivalry explains a lot. But it explains a lot in a general and wholesale sort of way. You will be hard put to it as economic determinist to account for the fiendish

delight accompanying the incredible lynching bees that are part of America's glorious record as the land of the free and the home of the brave. Not even normal psychology can light up that horrible reality. We must be wise in the ways of the dynamic psychopathologist to catch, in the network of our cunning insights, the complicated truth about the nature of that kind of torture. A knowledge of sadistic components in human nature, a perception of the perversions to which the consciousness of superiority may give rise, a realization of the great antiquity of the mood of malicious delight in a fellow being's pain, these perceptions and insights, and these alone can tell us what we need to know about inhuman nature.

To make of the environmental hypothesis first a fetish and then a scapegoat, a convenient alibi for human nature's unspeakable brutishness, is to misconceive a vast chunk of reality most naïvely. If the mind is ever to achieve wisdom, it will be through the precious and painful illumination of psychologic, and more particularly psychopathologic, ways of thinking. My proposition is that a truly adequate and therefore profound history of life will be written only when such pervasive forces as fear, love, vanity, (let us add anger, envy, hate) will be taken account of as the universal normal determinants of abnormal behavior. Nor does this theme touch upon those definitely pathologic twists and distortions of human motivation that underlie an enormous section of our complicated and most irrational reactions.

Try to imagine the meaning in history of such lurid realities as hallucinations, obsessions, delusions, paranoid trends, moods running the whole gamut of manic-depressive psychoses, psychoneurotic tensions and instabilities,

organic and functional inferiorities, phobias, hysterical outbreaks, tendencies to melancholia, sexual perversions, narcissistic attitudes, egotistic indulgences, exhibitionism, incalculable and maddening negativism, insane ambitiousness, anxiety, compulsions, habit neurosis, automatism in behavior, divinely inspired lunacies,—how can we sanely deny that we have not yet begun to comprehend more than the A B C of human behavior?

History began by being mythology. It was then transformed by the magic of rhetoric into fascinating chronicle. Facts and fictions were generously intermingled to the delight of writer and reader. Quaintly embroidered prejudices and preconceptions added their load of significance to historical writing in due course. Inspiration from on high guided the pen of the romantic-minded historian. Myth, magic, intuition, and misinformation filled the erudite textbooks. Facts were important only in an ornamental sense. Objectivity had not even been dreamed of. Insights had not yet been born. And though we live in a time when scientific methodology has become as austere and humorless as a veritable religion, when facts are worshipped as even virgins have never been, the excruciatingly pleasant fact remains that history is still a crazy-quilt of myth, magic, intuition, inspiration, prejudice, preconception, rationalization, complicated make-believe.

Our historians lacking the gift of wisdom, worship knowledge. Possessed of little insight, they adore information. Groping blindly in a welter of facts and fancies, they cling desperately to some promising guiding line along which they can steady their pompous generalizations. Of subtle realistic insight into the intricate workings of human nature they can hardly be accused

with any show of fairness. They are not psychologists. They are not psychopathologists. For all their dabbling in the affairs of mankind, they know nothing about men. They do not understand that the proper study of mankind is the irrationality of man. To study irrationality, as the psychiatrist studies his clinical "material", that will be the profound aim of historians when history comes of age.

Thorstein Veblen is the only historian among us who has this gift for seeing social forces as psychological behaviors. He possesses a talent for what I have referred to (in another connection) as *qualitative analysis.* Historians in general are capable only of what is a crude kind of quantitative analysis. Even Robinson's "The Mind In The Making", an important work, is detached from the main stream of his historical writing, a keen achievement in itself, but for all that, fragmentary and isolated. We must wait the advent of another Veblen, gifted not only with psychological insight, but additionally trained in clinical psychopathology, before we shall have a series of qualitative analyses of human behavior under civilization.

This complicated jangling horror which historians call contemporary civilization, how shall we understand or even partially control it unless we envisage it as a study in psychopathology? Let us begin with the undigestable nightmare of the World War. How many of the by-products of that colossal tragic-farce are to be sanely appreciated only by means of a psychology of insanity? The phenomenon of incessant dancing that followed madly, in Europe especially, upon the heels of the bleeding armistice. How is that to be explained? The psychoanalyst is at hand with his picturesque phrase: flight

from reality. And that's what it most assuredly was. To dance, to feel the throb of life, to know that one has escaped from death and mutilation, to reaffirm in one's own intoxicated person the electric reality of sensation, of spontaneity, of human charm, to dance until the reeling universe had been clean forgot in the bliss of sheer trance, was the all-consuming compulsive desire of humans who dared not remember what they could not forget: death, defeat, mutilation, horror, frustration, death, death! Life, sad beyond endurance, struggling desperately to be gay beyond endurance. The dance of life. In a graveyard. The triumph of the dance of life. Beautiful madness!

What is civilization? Economically, the conflict of classes for the control of the resources of the earth. Psychologically, the eternal human quest for privileged status. Men seek power, profit, and prestige. Toward the attainment of those avid ends, they employ the cunning devices of prejudice, pretense, pride. Psychopathologically, civilization is a study in disharmonies. Man, a savage simpleton, loving irresponsibility and the naked outdoors, cannot feel at home in the strait-jacket of a civilization that ruthlessly mechanizes every available impulse toward life and liberty he manifests. The mechanization of man is the outstanding fact of modern civilization. That mechanization is to be accounted for, in wholesale fashion, by a history of economic transformations, taking their rise in scientific inventions, with which we are all sufficiently familiar. The greater task is to understand the specific changes in human deportment, in desire and aspiration and Weltanschauung, precipitated by the economic revolution.

What is the relation between daily dumb drudgery and

the spreading night life of jazz and gin? What is the meaning of the creeping superficiality that has reduced contemporary culture to a state of pernicious anemia? What significance shall we ascribe to the sudden loosening of the moral sanctions in favor of a hectic experimenting with sex and love? What is the true account of the relation between the increasing normal acceptance of pathology and perversion as legitimate accessions to experience, and the mood of disillusion, of cynic contempt for ideals and ethical abstractions, that rides modernity like a crazy horseman? Who among us does not feel a certain deep deterioration in the quality of life itself? Not only capitalistic civilization as a technic of unscrupulous exploitation; not only contemporary civilization as a dark climax of modern history doomed to collapse by inexorable law (as a few savants claim); life itself is bankrupt.

Poetry is dying. Our poets are sick. They do not know what ails them. They are dimly aware that the disease called civilization ails them. They cannot be lyrical in the midst of machines that murder humanity's peace of mind. In the midst of so much cacophony, who can recollect emotion in tranquillity? Our poets cannot sing of beauty when all around them there is nothing but ugliness. Who can dream greatly in an environment where great dreams are so maddeningly irrelevant? Life has become coarse and callous and cheap. Life itself is bankrupt.

Merely to mention ideals is to invite a mockery of derision that sears one's sensitive soul. Human ideals are no longer in good standing. Utopia is child's folly. We are ashamed to be dreamers. The insistent world standardizes our dreams so that they may come giddily

true according to cool and sagacious specification. The center of life's interest has shifted from man as a refreshing personality, as a source of inspiration, to things as objects of true adoration. Man need not bestir himself to be interesting, inspiring, unique, since mechanism possesses most uncannily these rare attributes. Let us therefore be men of common-sense and worship the machines our grotesque civilization has created for our delight (and, who knows?, our damnation).

Life itself is bankrupt. Mention the writers or thinkers or philosophers in the contemporary world now reeling into maturity who possess, or are possessed by, great imagination? The failure of life in our mechanic modern world to produce great minds and great souls is an ominous fact. Why be a haunted creator when it is so easy to be a prosperous manufacturer? Why be a novelist when it is so much more pleasant and more profitable to be a journalist? Why be tortured with poetic longing when the rewards of being a sleek-hearted advertiser trafficking in bastard poetics are temptations not to be withstood in our make-believe civilization. Why be William Shakespeare when you can be Frank Crane?

> The world is too much with us; late and soon,
> Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers:
> Little we see in Nature that is ours;
> We have given our hearts away, a sordid boon!
> The Sea that bares her bosom to the moon;
> The winds that will be howling at all hours,
> And are up-gathered now like sleeping flowers;
> For this, for everything, we are out of tune;
> It moves us not.—Great God! I'd rather be
> A Pagan suckled in a creed outworn;
> So might I, standing on this pleasant lea,

Have glimpses that would make me less forlorn;
Have sight of Proteus rising from the sea;
Or hear old Triton blow his wreathèd horn.

We need to reopen the question as to the potentialities of human nature. There is a new science coming to fruition which humbly investigates the possibilities of human nature for reëducation.

We used to say very glibly, experience is the best teacher. Is it? We used to say as if it were axiomatic and beyond dispute, the past is the only intelligent guide to the future. Is it? We were fond of repeating that what man learns for himself serves him best. Does it? How often have we not reiterated the stale and stagnant platitude about our elders being our wisest teachers because they had lived through so much? Who any longer believes in our elders as being fitted by their life's experience for anything else but cremation? Almost everyone with a vested interest in pathos used to believe that suffering spiritualizes. What shall we do with the disheartening fact that suffering much more often hardens human nature, making it sclerotic and malicious? Suffering undoubtedly contributes the raw material of spirituality. Whether that raw material will be worked over into compassionate or callous patterns of behavior depends upon certain predispositions, certain capacities, for transcending the meanness and sordidness of suffering. Suffering frequently makes people stupid and uninteresting and pathologically self-centered. It is clearer than daylight that we need new wisdoms for old.

The science and art of reëducation promise beautifully for honest discovery of the rational and irrational potentialities resident in human nature. How can we longer

remain content with sacred platitudes and hearsay evidence concerning human nature, when every one of our pet preconceptions has met with so shattering a refutation from the facts of life, as we now begin to envisage them with the philosophic and psychopathologic assistance of microscopes invented by the psychoanalysts?

The big idea that has shattered the magic potency of the wholesale assumptions of heredity and of environment is the concept of predisposition. Psychoanalytic observation and behavioristic experimentation have established the prepotent influence of earliest childhood in the life-long behavior of a human being. The combination of the concept of predisposition, which implies the existence of psychological types (the glandular situation being an essential constituent), with the concept of childhood conditioning provides a drastically new basis for envisaging the relation between human nature and the social milieu.

In this psychological construction of reality, the environment as the source of stimuli cannot be allowed a disproportionate significance (as the economic determinists are wont to assign it), since the human organism, as the complicated center of responses, implying the still mysterious forces of selectivity, immunity, predisposition, is equally important in the final equation representing the interrelation of vital organism and dynamic environment.

Our profounder new knowledge is teaching us the vast sterilizing futility of leaning too heavily for clarity upon the logic of "either-or": we are confronting a world so complex that we must build up a subtle logic of "both-and." It is not a question of heredity *or* environment: the accurate way and certainly the more adequate way of

conceiving the problem is to think of heredity *and* environment. Such an approach, in a specific situation, takes cognizance of the flexible range of responsiveness of the organism and also the multiple nature of the stimulations of the environment.

If we shift this mode of approach back to the period of very early childhood, we gain a whole world of new insights. Heredity then looks like a more tractable and modest and amenable *set of potentialities.* Environment is no longer a vague inexorable external fate but becomes a series of manageable factors to be shaped toward specific goals set by a competent mind. Here we find ourselves in the presence of living reality, specific in its functioning, dynamic in its tendency, capable of direction. The science and art of reëducation take their rise in the brilliant discovery of the fluid and manageable nature of human behavior.

The enormously enlightening concepts of predisposition and of conditioning in childhood remind us of the corrective which the new psychology offers to the old economics. Though it is painful to admit it, it is quite true that life had existed on this planet for a considerable period before Karl Marx came on the scene. Let little fevered radicals remember this startling fact. The new psychology shows up the numerous blind spots in economic theorizing done in the wholesale fashion. For consolation, let the beloved comrades be assured of the authentic treasonableness of my utterance, for the twin immortal Bolsheviks, Trotsky and Radek, agree that a bridge of accommodation can be ingeniously constructed between Marxism and Psychoanalysis.

I envisage human life since its dark inception among the humorless anthropoids as a series of interminable

complications in the superior-inferior relation. You can talk yourself red, white, and blue in the face, until the crack of capitalist doom, about the economic determinants of the superior-inferior relation among men. Unless you can supplement it with psychologic and pathologic insights you will be missing at least half the troubling truth about homosapiens.

Take the laughter-provoking irony of a class of exploited workers lifting themselves by various marvelously selfish devices into a closed corporation charmingly described as the aristocracy of labor. What pretty phenomenon do we here observe? Will a Marxian theory of the division of society, in wholesale fashion, into two classes, the exploiters and the exploited, the capitalists and the proletarians, adequately account for the existence of an aristocracy of labor? But a bright knowledge of human nature in relation to its tainted and egocentric motivations will go a long way toward accounting for that phenomenon.

We know to our dismal chagrin that our labor leaders are not labor leaders at all but the lieutenants of capitalism. Bourgeois habits of living are very congenial to them. They are among the worst enemies of proletarian emancipation. How now, camerado? Will economic-analysis alone give us a true insight into this traitor behavior of our so-called labor leaders? Must we not invoke the subtle aid of a little psychoanalysis? It is permissible to ask the economic radical: have you a little psychoanalysis in your home?

Sometimes, it seems as if human beings were devoting themselves unremittingly to the solution of one gnawing problem: to transcend the status of inferiority. This fact, richly psychologic in significance, colors all eco-

nomic analysis perceptibly. It opens up the whole question of whether small concentrated minorities are not the only ones really equipped by genuine superiority to run the affairs of mankind, the majority of inferiors compensating for personal inadequacy by playing the game according to the rules set by their manipulators.

One of the most illuminating ideas contributed by the new psychology is Jung's conception of the two types of human behavior which he calls the introvert and the extrovert. Those who are enamored of the statistical conception of human ability and response have scant respect for a theory of types. Their reasonable assumption is that every form of response or of capacity follows a "normal curve of distribution" representing degrees and gradations. On this assumption there cannot be a pure type sharply distinct from any other type. To begin with, a man may be extremely sensitive in relation to the esthetic quality of his surroundings, moderately sensitive to the pitch of his friends' voices, feebly sensitive to public opinion, and positively insensitive to the beauty of mathematics. It is hardly reasonable, on this statistical view of reality, to speak of sensitiveness as if it were a wholesale attribute of a human nature, static, predetermined, true at all times.

For all that, shelving statistical precision for the moment, we may grant the fruitfulness of the Jungian conception. We do discover broad differences on many levels of human responsiveness, in relation to many kinds of stimulation, along the lines of such antithetical attributes as sensitive-callous, tender-tough-minded, introverted-extroverted. Recent experimental studies are reaffirming the essential truth in Jung's conception. There is some truth and a lot of wisdom in his exposition of the

fundamental misunderstanding and disharmony as between human beings who live in vital particulars by the psychologic outlook of the introvert and of the extrovert. Think of two such interesting men as Roosevelt and Wilson as splendidly illustrative of this distinction between "types". The former possessed the energy of a dynamo in ceaseless activity, spending himself lavishly on a thousand activities every one of which was characterized by two supplementary attributes: concern with external events and a marvelous absence of concern for those internal events which the philosopher and the mystic and the analyst know as the inner life, involving the crucial importance of introspection and reverie. In the case of Wilson we are in the presence of a personality qualitatively different, your typical introvert. His outstanding characteristics were shyness, sensitiveness, detachment, inner disharmony, subtlety, moodiness. His energies were largely entangled in his private personality. When we think of these two Americans, we do seem to get some light on Jung's categories.

It is worth while noting in this connection that the profoundest tendency in contemporary psychopathology is precisely the envisagement of human personality, whether from a physical or a psychological angle, as belonging primarily in one of two categories, to one of two types: those whose energy spills over excessively into the environment, in manic fashion, and those whose energy recoils upon themselves, in a kind of dementia præcox withdrawal from external reality: the so-called cycloid and schizoid types. There appears to be, according to the great authority of experts like Kretschmer, a significant correlation between the physique and the psychologic reaction patterns of these types.

Surely no one who is in the least impressed by the discoveries of dynamic psychiatry can fail to appreciate what a world of new possibilities has been opened up for the keener comprehension of human behavior. Sociology will gradually be broken up into a multitude of specific studies in psychology, and psychology will undergo an increasing re-analysis by means of psychiatric technics. Thus the whole field of the human sciences will gradually come under the influence of psychopathology. The results for our general enlightenment promise to be nothing short of revolutionary. The pioneer work of the brilliant English anthropologist Rivers in linking the psychoanalytic way of thinking with biology, ethnology, politics, war, medicine, academic psychology, is a hint of what we may expect in greater abundance in the near future.

The conviction grows that none of the social sciences can be grounded in realistic insights unless they first undergo a drastic catharsis at the hands of a psychology humanized by the clinical concepts of psychiatry.

From what source can we get the greater illumination in comprehending the differences between peoples: from economics or from psychology? Let us try the experiment with a brief discussion of the temperament of the Russian as in so many fundamental ways different from the temperament of the American. I acknowledge at once the enormous importance in a general way, as loose historical background, of the economic factors in the situation. But if I seek to come to closer grips with my analysis of *specific* differences, I must either remain blind to vital determinants or seek the assistance of dynamic psychology toward clarifying these temperamental unlikenesses.

I shall not deal with the as yet elusive factors of internal chemistry, the glandular situation, hereditary constituents, obscure physical components in personality development. Let us try a simpler problem. Why, for instance, has the American, even the cultured and widely read American, always thought of Russian literature as morbid? How explain the profound presence in Russian literature of pathos, most poignantly portrayed in Chekov, and its almost universal absence from American literature? How light up the sharp difference between the heartbreaking profundity of Russian literature and the heart-emptying superficiality of American literature? What is the key to the Russian respect for life at every human level of existence however sordid and degrading and realistic, as contrasted with the American evasion of life to the extent that it is frank and natural and human? The most sincere people in the world are the Russians. The most hypocritical people in the world are the Americans (this Christian superiority in etiquette used to belong to the English).

If there be any one overriding factor in this complicated situation, it is the long acquaintance of the Russians with suffering that leadeth to compassion, and the non-acquaintance of the Americans with such suffering. Americans are capable of charity but not of compassion. I do not doubt for a moment the great importance of economic forces in bringing about these differences. What I do doubt is even their remote adequacy in penetrating the core of the matter which is psychologic and pathologic in essence.

The psychology of individual differences is a most enlightening contribution to our general fund of bewildering knowledge about man and his potentialities. We can

fallaciously insist, loyal to a mass logic, that individual differences are not significant. We can, rather foolishly, agree with the behaviorist when he dogmatically assures us of his ability, under adequately controlled conditions, to produce talent and genius to order. But if we continue as skeptics to be perturbed by individual differences and their high relevancy to the conduct of life, we shall pursue more deeply than ever the inquiry into the nature of individual variations in potentiality, capacity, ability; into the meaning of mental deficiency, mediocrity, talent, and genius. We shall be especially interested in the educational problem of whether mediocrity can be transformed, by subtle devices of reëducation, into talent. The salvation of the human race, if its salvation does not ultimately lie in its extinction, depends upon tapping the potentialities of mediocrities in the sublime hope of bringing to light richer possibilities of human fulfillment.

Mental defectives, thanks to God and Chance, will be with us always. Mediocrity has come triumphantly into its own and lauds it over the contemporary universe. There is a pathetic shortage of genius. Talents, we may optimistically conjecture, exist in a decent abundance but are mutilated, homeless, bruised, prostituted in one shabby way or another. Under what environmental conditions, can a maximum amount of talent and genius be evoked? That problem belongs not to the economist, not even to the sociologist; it belongs to the educator and the psychologist, more particularly to those who are wise in the wisdom of psychopathology, reëducation, psychoanalysis.

What do we know about human nature that we should be so desperately certain about our swashbuckling dog-

mas concerning either heredity or environment? Psychology is only in its teens. Psychoanalysis is still in its swaddling clothes. Reëducation has just been conceived. Behaviorism is enjoying the felicities appropriate to the intra-uterine state. We really know plus nothing about human nature (though, I grant, our knowledge of inhuman nature is woefully complete). In the light of our glowing ignorance about human nature, why do we foolishly insist upon the validity of economic and social propositions which, in the nature of the case, constitute a chapter in radiant illiteracy?

Can we even pretend to have an adequate social science unless we are already in possession of an adequate psychologic science? To put it more sharply, a psychology, humanized by psychiatry, must precede an economics or a sociology adequate to the purposes for which it is framed in a world as complex as man's has come to be.

In sketchy fashion, let us cast our eyes over such familiar problems as race antagonism, patriotism, nationalism, international relations, diplomatic usage, good will, intangible assets, business ethics, etc. And what do we discern? In the larger sense, problems in economics. More precisely, however, problems in psychology and psychopathology. You can't possibly grasp the essence of patriotism except by analyzing out such human nature factors as fear, pride, egotism, sadism, the sense of inferiority seeking compensation in the will-to-dominance, habits of loyalty, attitudes of credulity, customs of conformity, impulses of servility;—the whole fascinating subject-matter of dynamic psychology spilling over into the pathologic pools of psychiatry.

Here is one momentous episode lighting up the precariousness of the economic hypothesis. Go back to that

far-off malign event referred to as The Great War. In Germany, a remarkable socialistic movement had been developing for more than half a century, built upon the drastic doctrine of class struggle. Millions of humble enlightened Germans were acquainted with the revolutionary logic of socialism. A group of brilliant and courageous leaders like Marx, Engels, Bebel, Kautsky, Liebknecht, Luxembourg, had incessantly been at the job of propounding the ethic of internationalism as the only correct political morality for the working class. On the eve of the war in 1914, a powerful movement was in existence, dedicated to class struggle and internationalism, equipped therefore to hold in leash Kaiserian nationalism and the menace of provincial patriotism. Well, we all know what happened: the incredible collapse of that entire movement. I am not interested at this point in discussing that situation at all. I am concerned merely with pointing out the inexplicableness of that event in terms of purely economic determinants. Psychologically, the crisis is understandable.

Psychologically, there was a critical contradiction in the minds of these millions of splendid Germans between habits of loyalty to the State and habits of loyalty to a philosophy of the state. As in every pragmatic situation, philosophy crumbled at the violent touch of realpolitik. A theory of internationalism clashed with a living loyalty to nationalism: the theory surrendered. I could offer a more complicated and subtle psychologic analysis of this crisis in behavior but for my purposes I shall content myself with reiterating how inadequate logical, i.e., economic analysis is in such a case, how necessary is the supplementary critique of psycho-logical analysis.

There is a mythological element in all belief, sincere though it may be, that reveals itself as such when a crisis of practicality supervenes compelling a choice between familiarity and novelty, between customary responses to reality and theoretic responses to a kind of unreality. In that event, the mythological nature of sincere belief is exposed rather ruthlessly, to the discomfiture of the devout and orthodox.

A far-seeing idea is born in a great mind. The idea becomes in the course of repetition and habituation congealed into a dogma. The dogma is then acceptable to the little minds, the disciples, the worshipful followers, the enthusiastically narrow-minded army of intellectual parrots who constitute the mass movements of history. If the stereotyped dogma is to achieve the status of a great idea among little minds, it must be surrounded with a halo of mythology. A critical idea has become an uncritical myth.

Is it not reasonable to assert that the minds of average men contain, not ideas, but dogmas and myths? In a concrete crisis involving life and death, these average minds, never really gripped by the idea but merely stirred and inflated by the myth, suddenly seized with the far-off unnatural character of the myth, in a panic of self-preservation, are left with no choice but to embrace the horrid immediate reality of the moment, patriotism, fatherland, safety-first. The instinct of self-preservation leading to the general suicide! Pathos of practicality. The habit of dying for one's country is too deep-ingrained in the reaction systems of the mass of automata called our fellow-citizens to be lightly dispensed with because of mere logical loyalty to class and supranationalism.

Take at random a cluster of problems usually thought of by radicals of the red variety as wholly economic in texture. No one, who is competent to speak in the premises, will want to deny how prominent the psychologic and pathologic components in these situations bulk. For example; what are the Freudian elements in a typical Southern lynching? Why does every society make a scapegoat of a given group upon whom it can, without conscience pangs, reek its shameful vengeances? To what an extent is the scapegoat theory applicable in the sphere of morals? What was the special brand of psychopathological motivation that underlay the cruel and unusual punishments meted out by the liberal government of Messrs. Wilson and Baker to the inoffensive band of beautifully courageous Conscientious Objectors? What was the psychology of the American Federation of Labor when it endorsed so enthusiastically a capitalist-imperialist war which meant inevitably the slaughter of its own kind? When judges hand out their unimaginative five, ten, fifteen, twenty, thirty year sentences, are they responding primarily to motives and habits that are economic or psychologic in their deepest context? And if we attempt to fathom the brutish judicial murder of the two humble philosophical anarchists, Sacco and Vanzetti, are we not straightway hurled into that irrational world where clinical psychiatry sanely sits and studies a weird variety of lunacies?

Habits and habit distortions; instincts and instinctive disharmonies; impulses and impulsive maladjustments; customs and social repressions; moral contradictions and conflicts; inhibitions and frustrations; infantile regressions; flights from reality:—these constitute a keener

approach to what is fundamental in human nature than can be elicited by mere economic analysis.

If we attempt briefly to psychologize certain institutions, we find habits, complicated by considerations of power and prestige, at the basis of the hold these institutions have upon humanity. The state is an endless drill in habits of loyalty. The great aim is embodied in patriotic malevolence, or more simply, patriotism. The school is a long series of exercises in credulity: the goal achieved by conventional education is polished pretense, the good manners appropriate to dignified serfs. Education is a finishing school in servility. The home is a torture chamber where compulsory love is ever busy at the sweet task of inculcating dependence. The product of this affectionate perverting of human nature is pity. Since the members of a household cannot love one another, they can be inoculated with the germs of pity.

The church is a sacred barracks where little tin gods, the mercenaries of the Christly life, are brought into a state of hypnosis which makes possible and pleasant a quite subconscious training in stultification. The grandiose result is a cult of stupidity that no amount of intellectual dynamite can ever bring disaster to. Sanctified stupidity. Big Business is a training school (mostly night courses when conscience is a little sleepy) in habits of duplicity, the shining objective being legalized fraud. Journalism is a flourishing enterprise that lives by falsification and profitable concealment, whose honorable aim is to lift lying to the plane of a fine art. And Society, that gracious hypocrite, contributes to our psychological insight in ways too numerous even to mention. Society is a post-graduate course in cunning. Society teaches us how to rationalize our contradictions so that we may

securely proceed with the spiritual business of climbing into positions of power, profit, and prestige on the acquiescent backs of our fellow men.

What we call institutions are a rather well-knit set of habits of believing, acting, and falsifying, whereby more gold and glory may be allotted to our share by the charming influence of push and pull. The phenomena of human life are fascinatingly psychologic in texture.

There are departments of human expression in which the psychopathologic emphasis on behavior is so startling as to make one wake with a gasp to the profound import of that approach to reality. I refer to literature in particular, to art in general, and to the sciences that deal with sexual phenomena. Contemporary literature, to the extent that it is vital and arresting, is almost exclusively a portrayal of behavior from a pathological point of view. The work of Masters, Joyce, Lawrence, O'Neill, Anderson, Jeffers, is an eloquent demonstration of the theme I am presenting. Literature, to the extent that it has been penetrating and poignant, has always been loaded with characters and situations decidedly erratic, erotic, neurotic: abnormal: evil stuff. More recently, thanks in part to the psychoanalytic influence, our writers have grown even bolder and, in tortured quest of the unspeakable truths about human nature, have actually moved into the forbidden lands of pathology and perversion. Literary studies dealing with autoerotism, homosexuality, incest, are coming into vogue everywhere. The psychiatric attitude toward life, involving as it does a candid handling of morbid and shamelessly clinical material, appeals to the literary mind. All forms of writing tend increasingly to become autobiographical and psychoanalytic.

When we come to the sciences that deal specifically with sexual phenomena, like certain branches of biology and of medicine, sexology, psychoanalysis, we know ourselves in the presence of the psychiatrist's especial domain. Who else is so well equipped to approach with knowledge and skill the distracting contemporary problems of experimental mating, adultery, sex perversion, marital disharmony, the aftermath of divorce, moral contradictions, jazz debauchery, all the chaos of the age? A courageous historian of modernity may come along one of these abnormal days and write a brilliant study entitled, The Psychoanalytic Age. No title could be more appropriate.

The revolution in personal deportment provoked by "birth control" illuminates the human nature factors in the reconstruction of civilization. Though economic status is highly correlated with family limitation, the quintessence of the sexual revolution lies in the psychologic, not in the economic, realities. Personal ambition, love of leisure, self-indulgence, evasion of the burden of pregnancy, pursuit of pleasure as the new goal of marriage, contempt for fecundity, cultural status, unadorned egotism, are the major facts to be reckoned with in any satisfactory analysis of the revolution in the sex and love life of latter-day mates.

We are getting wise to the fact that every event in life, however objective, impersonal, sociological, historical it may be, however much it may hide itself in the austere garb of social forces, inevitability, necessity, evolution, fate, drags with it, as intimate associate, a psychological residue, a personal equation, and we insist upon discovering the human nature constituents imbedded in it. This new-found faith in the intricate relevancy of the per-

sonal equation in all human thought is yielding some very surprising results, some of them silly, many of them remarkable.

There is a fine irony in this situation. At the very point in its career when science crowed most lustily over its creation of objectivity in thought, a wonderful renaissance of subjectivity swept full sail into the life of reason, to the discomfiture of the sacred guardians of the truth. To how far an extent this psychoanalytic, biographic, and relativistic view of reality has gone, we need only remind ourselves of the fact that the new physics uses the concept of biography; that Bertrand Russell actually suggests "a science of particulars" as the ultimately adequate one, that psychology and physics approach each other most intimately; that the penetrating subjectivism of psychoanalysis has enriched all the human sciences with brilliant novel concepts; and most alarming of all, the relativistic point of view has taken the pomp and arrogance out of metaphysics, revealing with perfect clarity how each system of metaphysics is fundamentally a work of art, peculiar to an individual of unique temperament, who unconsciously employed the devices of rationalization and self-delusion to cover up and adorn the pet prejudices and charming limitations of his all-too-human personality.

Even that chaste and cool contemner of life, Logic, has been psychologized. Mathematics has had to make room for the personal equation. So far as the living universe is envisaged by the mind of man, every construction of reality, however metaphysical or dialectical or impersonal (cosmic, as these technicians love to call it), is tainted with the human equation.

To discover why certain superior minds have delighted

to think themselves inaccessibly detached from that corruption of life called foible and error; to understand the nature of the fantastic superstition which made certain cultivated minds believe themselves specially endowed with a capacity for pursuing The Truth; to unearth the roots of the bizarre patterns of thought that got themselves so strangely plastered over the minds of metaphysicians;—all this will be the work of great psychoanalysts in the future. The mechanism of "flight from reality" with the accompanying consoling device of "rationalization" will be found to play their oh how important rôles!

Assuming (generously) that philosophy has sought to fathom the rationality of man, then we may say that psychology, of the psychoanalytic turn of mind, has endeavored to fathom man's irrationality. In this difference of aims we discover also the great difference between the shallowness of formal logic and the profundity of psycho-logic. Formal logic can yield knowledge but no wisdom.

Civilization, we now for the first time clearly perceive, is a study in psychopathology. Normal academic psychology can tell us almost nothing, really worth while knowing, about the jangling disharmonies of civilization. But abnormal clinical psychology can give us penetrating insights into the conflicts resident in human nature and the contradictions implicit in civilization. In the near future our normal interest will be centered in abnormal psychology.

When we survey such socially impressive phenomena as propaganda, publicity, advertising, the use and abuse of science, herd behavior, the love of sports, the regimenting ritual of radio-activity, the standardizing of opinion, the deep desire to seek prestige through the

quaint hocus-pocus of exclusive fraternities, clubs, sects, organizations, not to omit the widespread influence of imitation, social contagion, fads and fancies, we find ourselves in the presence of a bewildering variety of belief and behavior that cannot be satisfactorily accounted for except by the new psychology.

If you doubt the prepotent rôle in human life of psychology, especially as it overflows into psychopathology, try to explain such phenomena as these: Tantrums, bullying, shyness, bragging, day-dreaming, laziness, sadism, masochism, anxiety, "nervousness," nightmare, moodiness, phobias, compulsions, obsessions, melancholia, flight from reality, religiousness, "washing mania," puritanism, exhibitionism, smut, megalomania, hysteria, the sense of inferiority, the will-to-dominance, self-abnegation, lust, avarice, "conspicuous waste," the jazz age, temperament, narcissism, envy, conscience pangs, sex perversions, queer traits, callousness, sensitiveness, idealism, marriage as neurotic bondage, heaven and hell.

In short, try to explain human nature without psychology! Human nature is a study in irrationality.

If you grant the plausible proposition that fear and faith, sex and desire, ego and frustration, inferiority and compensation, shame and concealment, vanity and make-believe, rationalization and evasion, pride and prejudice, are among the fundamental forces that supply the drives and goals of human behavior, whatever the form of the society in which they function, you concede all that is necessary for the establishment of the overwhelming importance of psychology among the arts and sciences.

Psychiatry to the rescue!

If in this essay I have not drawn sharp lines of distinction between psychology and psychiatry, the neglect

has been quite intentional. The rather foolish and sterile compartmentalization of knowledge that makes our universities so much like department stores deserves nothing but contempt. The professorlings feel at home in neat little universes of discourse just large enough for their small souls. Psychology, in attaining to maturity, becomes psychiatrized. Psychiatry, in achieving scientific precision, moves closer to psychology as an experimental science. To speak of normal psychology is to refer to something that becomes increasingly meaningless. There is human nature and there is human maladjustment. Hence the need of a realistic psychology that embodies the point of view of mental hygiene. Civilization is a study in pathology and perversion. Human beings are increasingly troubled by internal disharmonies and external maladjustments. How is civilization to be saved from an almost inevitable wreckage? How is human nature to be saved from psychoneurotic breakdown? How is life to be saved from disheartenment, disillusion, disenchantment?

These baffling problems can be wisely approached only from the dynamic and humanistic point of view of the new type of psychiatry which the science and art of reeducation are developing for the rational amelioration of our irrational lives.

Our faith in civilization is at ebb tide. How shall we rebuild in man the music and the dream?

I couldn't help being interested in the following rather illuminating quotation: "Lenin has been virtually canonized. Every club-house, every meeting-room, every factory has its Lenin corner. Here the icon has given place to the portrait of Lenin; the Bible, to his 'Collected Works.' The Lenin Mausoleum in the Red Square in Moscow has become a Mecca for countless thousands of devout pilgrims. Indeed, the worship of Lenin seems to have become the moral equivalent of religion and patriotism." From "Lenin—A Legend in the Making," by Joshua Kunitz in *The Nation,* Feb. 8, 1928.

## Chapter V

# IS PROSTITUTION PETERING OUT?

It is impossible to talk about prostitution without immediately wanting to say something about marriage.

The outstanding fact about marriage, historically conceived, is its kill-joy quality. This fact alone accounts enormously for the existence and success of prostitution. In every language, prostitutes are referred to by pet phrases full of endearment and light-hearted charm. For example, filles de joie, freude-mädchen, sisters of mercy, etc., indicating the mood of delight.

The only words rivaling in deliciousness these pet names and frequently applied to women eligible for marriage are darling and sweetheart. It is painful to have to report that these wonderfully endearing epithets are usually employed with sincerity only before marriage. The cases where they continue to be ecstatically sweet after marriage are so rare (excluding sheer nauseating habit routine and stereotypy) as to constitute a very special study in statistics.

The great point is the enduring cleavage between light-hearted love expressing itself in passionate moods of felicity and rather heavy-hearted love expressing itself in more or less passionless moods of make-believe happiness. To understand this deep fact is to know something of life's pain and to be prepared at least in clarity to reconceive the relation of the sexes in some new way, promising for marital beauty.

The poets of the race have celebrated this cleavage by a wholly ironic omission: marriage is not the high theme of lyrical enchantment but spontaneous free love is. Is there a quality inherent in marriage that insidiously undermines the mood of joy? Is there a quality imbedded in spontaneous free love that releases charm and ecstasy quite casually and naturally? I can imagine no queries more worth while asking and more desperately in need of illuminating answer.

The Greek conception of marriage conceived woman as a drudge and an inferior whom one used for natural purposes without the remotest thought of joy or delight. Philosophers were content to mate with these dumb-drudges for the simple sake of physico-chemical reproduction. For the indulgence of their more gracious moods, the wise ones sought the company of fascinating courtesans who were freed from the burden of fecundity, being set apart by personal temperament and by the dialectical persuasions of the savants for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In that ancient learned world sex as a thing of beauty was worshipped outside the bonds of marriage. Greek and Roman mythology are so many delightful narratives of the fascination and solace of free love.

The Christian conception of love continued the Pagan degradation of the begetting female of the species and added its black condemnation of the joyousness of sex in any form whatsoever. Thus sex love became a curse whether practised as a duty or as a delight. Love as procreation was shamefully slandered by the (oversexed) theologians and as darkly ostracized when recreation was its goal. It is not at all easy to understand this long wrestling of the human flesh with its own most urgent

desires. Repression became the very essence of religion from the Christian point of view. Fecundity was blessed not because it contributed happiness to marriage but because it contributed strength to the church. For centuries it seems not to have occurred to human beings to realize that sex love was in some fairly important way related to their own private personalities. Sex as delightful self-indulgence, when conceived of at all, was viewed as the most heinous of offenses against God, the Holy Ghost, the Christ Jesus, not to mention the Holy Virgin. Sex love, in brief, was very unholy.

Marriage as fecundity inevitably engenders sobriety and monotony and painful routine. The unblest women of the race who could not escape the doom of fecundity paid the penalty of never experiencing sexual delight. Perhaps the compensation of maternal fulfillment in some half-obscure way more than neutralized the failure to experience romantic and passionate love. Under the régime of fecundity, woman, mere drudge and sexual serf, becomes too soon an unappetizing female in whose daily life routine and fatigue and ailing and joylessness play their wretched rôles unceasingly. Marriage easily takes on the attributes and behaviors of a hospital. Something in old-fashioned marriage produces an atmosphere of sickness. The woman is reduced to a whining, helpless, semi-invalid state of botched ineptitude, a pathetic victim of fecundity and domestic drudgery. From this hospital atmosphere men sought to escape by the familiar salvations of drink, gambling, and heart-easing prostitution.

Hetaira, free beauties, intellectual courtesans, lovely whores, promiscuous ladies, common prostitutes, are all ingenious psychopathologic devices contrived by the

overburdened mind of man as sources of consolation and compensation for the torturing realities of marriage and duty and responsibility and conscience pangs. They represent the dark joy of living! From the martyrdom of marriage man sought escape in the perilous delights of prostitution. From that martyrdom the women of the race dared find no such irresponsible escape but sought the consolation of religion and self-sacrifice.

Thus the mothers of men were honored for their nobility while the daughters of joy were enshrined (in the innermost dark souls of men) for their ignobility. A certain playful disreputability became the very essence of the joy of living, yet somehow that mood of playfulness was deemed irrelevant and shameful in the marriage relation, so that marriage became a sacred routine, a passionless ceremonial, a kill-joy. Throughout the perturbed history of man's pursuit of life and love, we witness the baffling conflict between sex joy as disreputability, and wedded love as too reputable for the happy degradation of sheer fun.

As a result of her long discipline in passionless sexual servility, woman finally became expert in passivity. In truth, anything but sheer passivity in the marriage relation would have stamped her, in her own sight most assuredly, even more than in the eyes of her mate, as an improper and possibly an unchaste creature. Passivity was necessarily her rôle if she would communicate to her spouse (and to her own intimidated heart) the certainty that he had married a respectable, virtuous, i.e., a passionless woman who was by that very token morally fit to be the honorable mother of his children.

Upon the sex behavior of the prostitute no such limitation of sheer passivity was laid either by man or by

her own ethic. It was her business to develop technics and tricks for making sex love an interesting experience to her clients. She was equal to the task before her. Her skill and success lay precisely in a mode of behavior that substituted participation and exhibitionistic procedure and personal activity in lieu of coyness and make-believe indifference and passionless passivity. If we do not understand the profound implications of these long-enduring facts, we shall never know how to interpret wisely the ancient rivalry, still in full force, between marriage and prostitution. Man's anarchic fund of free playful energy which he enjoyed using for sexual delight found no adequate outlet in marriage. He did the next best thing: he sought opportunities for play and self-indulgence outside of marriage. Which, I understand, he is still doing.

In summary, we envisage a deep duality in sexual behavior sprung from the antithesis between passivity and spontaneity. Can the subordination of procreation to recreation that characterizes ultra-modern marriage succeed in substituting spontaneity for passivity in the sex relation? If marriage is to hold its own against free love, it will have to develop immeasurably more passionateness than it has ever known how to do thus far.

It's a pity we are constrained to think of the mothers of men as having been sexual serfs. Under the compulsion of fecundity, no sweeter choice was possible. In the realm of sex, Nature has made man her playboy and favorite. His libidinous energy, being always on tap, could easily be utilized for Nature's ultimate goal of procreation or for Man's immediate goal of recreation. Woman was saddled with a heavier responsibility, the rather solemn obligation to be maternal. Maternity is a serious

business that leaves little energy or mood for fun. Man, the privileged sexual anarch, his part in the sexual ceremonial charmingly simple, could lightheartedly roam the fields of erotic adventure and perpetrate whatever acts of felicity the opportunities of the open road cordially afforded.

Woman's major problem in moralistic strategy has been to cancel out of existence this inequality that works favorably in man's behalf, to load him with obligations and responsibilities and neurotic remorse to the point where he will simply not be able to summon the mood for indulging playful erotic impulses. Marriage has been the startling device by which man's joy in living was sufficiently destroyed to make him amenable to the compulsions of duty and marital loyalty. The costs in general happiness of this crucifixion of male playfulness have never been estimated by the moralists of the race. In fact, we have all learned to make a virtue of misery, to be ashamed of happiness, to deny that sex joy is important, to celebrate marital fidelity as somehow infinitely better than sexual felicity. In short, we have all become heartbroken evaders and falsifiers and moralistic liars. Woman's attempt to overcorrect Nature, as I like to refer to it, has wrought some good and a vast amount of evil. It will be a sign of spiritual renascence when men and women consciously undertake to respect natural impulse more and make-believe morality less. It may be that the sexes will erelong work out a harmony of desire and fulfillment that will courageously attempt to give Nature a more generous opportunity for self-expression, slighting neither the human nature of woman nor the sex nature of man.

One might reason, on purely psychological grounds,

that the very simplicity, the apparent insignificance of man's contribution to reproduction, was itself a big factor in impelling his thwarted ego to search for compensatory solace in the "conquest" of woman. This Adlerian motif deserves attention in this connection. Pregnancy is an enormous fulfillment for the woman: it is a very minor fulfillment for the man. What was our frustrated egotist to do not to feel inferior and even downcast in the presence of his flourishing female, radiant with the triumph to which he had contributed but a half-remembered musical accompaniment?

My conjecture is that the piqued ego of the male, privately wounded by the realization of marital insignificance, was driven to a behavior that promised a redress of a truly cosmic grievance: he went forth in eager mood for conquest and brought home exhilarating memories of sexual triumphs. The male sought to compensate in promiscuous sexing for the humble part assigned him in reproduction. Nor need this explanation be rejected because a considerable number of men were doomed to be content with the simple pseudo-triumph of domesticity. The ego fulfillment that comes from the irresponsible and happy-go-lucky conquest of women need not always take place in factual reality: it flourishes most luxuriantly in compensatory reverie: man's sweetest sex acts take place in his passionate imagination. One might put it more exactly and say that the private mind of a man is the continuing narrative of adultery delightfully consummated. Passion's wonderful excess is spent extra-maritally in fact or in reverie. Why is passion so pent-up in marriage?

Every man not a congenital eunuch is eager to play the part of passionate lover and as eager not to be in the

rôle of automatized husband. The stale and static categories of wife and husband are undergoing a wholesome psycho-sexual transformation.

Nor may we omit the overwhelming importance of forces like novelty, zest, stimulation, egotism, forbidden fruits, temptation in various delightful guises, sexual potency, exhibitionism, braggartism, the variety of human nature, of appetite, desire, potentiality.

These thrilling factors in the adventurous life of sex are recognized for their true value in the earlier playful stages of sex companionship when marriage hovers but dimly on the far horizon and is for all human purposes incredibly remote. The sublimated adultery, the refined promiscuity, the experimental moods of love-making that occupy so significant a place in the experiences of young men and young women are accepted by all of us, even those who are handicapped by a puritan conscience, as the permissible patterns of youthful behavior in its desperately lyrical groping toward sexual happiness.

May it not be that the quintessential cruelty of conventional marriage resides precisely in the strenuous taboo set upon these thrilling forces of novelty and pleasurable temptation? If sobriety is the death of novelty, and if novelty be the charm of sex love, why wonder that stereotyped wedlock is exposed on all fronts to the clandestine invasion of secret desires and temptations that increasingly set up their powerful claims against the exclusivism and self-righteousness of traditional marriage?

What we characteristically discover is an evolution in marriage which includes an initial stage of tempestuous sexual eagerness (which initiated the marriage), the complication of lovely erotic desire by rather irrelevant problems of human nature that introduce more and more

havoc into sex love until a stage is reached when passionate sex desire has deteriorated into mere marital routine; marital love in the course of time inexorably petering out, leaving a stale residue of lovelessness. The original (almost aboriginal) sweet lust for felicity has spent itself, not in astonishing acts of love nor in personal exhilaration, but in trivial and painful digressions involving small but persistent problems of maladjustment on the human level where egotism and narcissism get in their deadly poison, rendering love as an experience of ecstasy a quite impossible thing.

Or, and this is frequently enough the marital plight, marriage as a kind of permanent guarantee of institutional security, come what may, corrupts the mood of eagerness and makes a mockery of spontaneity. The creative urge is flattened out by marital complacency. Passion is not experienced passionately as though it were the unforgettable living essence of desire, a marvelously fresh and radiant knowledge, but is rather approached incidentally, half-heartedly, as if nothing very momentous were in view, since the long stretch of the years will surely guarantee many automatic felicities. This failure to realize the dramatic intensity and beautiful condensation of love's desire underlies a good deal of the emptiness and disappointment of lovers securedly wedded. The divine element of immediacy, of irrevocable beauty, is absent from their tepid moods and pseudo-passionate embraces.

And so it comes to pass that eager eyes, dreaming of strange tumultuous delights, peer quizzically beyond the sacred bedroom windows far out upon perilous landscapes that beckon to delightful destruction. Temptation is the darling mistress no man's mind can utterly

forget. The triumph of the whore symbolizes the survival in a repressive and asphyxiated world of the high evaluation even moral men and women set upon the dark poetry of passion. Next to the holy Virgin, the unholy courtesan most fascinates the hearts of the moral folk. Who that is not emotionally dead can resist the happy contagion of experience that is spontaneous, lyrical, novel, forbidden, disreputable, pleasurable, mad, evil? And marriage as we all sadly know, is not these shameful and delightful things. But not for ever will eager-hearted men and women sanction this troubling cleavage between the passionate spontaneity of love and the passionless routine of marriage.

It may be that a more subtle knowledge of physiology, a keener sex-consciousness on the part of women, a more brilliant utilization of erotic technique, a more pagan conception of married love, may all conspire to bring into existence a new type of marriage in which passion and spontaneity and lyrical love will triumph beautifully for a considerable period. After all, the problem of sexual felicity is quite a new one. The potentialities of sex love have not yet been even superficially tapped. We yearn to be artists in love but we painfully know ourselves to be terrible bunglers.

We may discover that marriage, as the embodiment of the desire to share the meanings of sex and personality in all their varied intimacy for a lifetime, will not be the irrational and psychopathic reality it has been throughout the dark subservient ages, if we appreciate the remarkably new content, sexually and humanly, that modern new knowledge and wisdom are imparting to the relations of men and women. It may be that our very experimental mood will finally contrive modes of living to-

gether that are erotically joyous and humanly enriching: these liberating patterns of behavior may then achieve a certain status, an experimental norm, which will guarantee to lovers that precious interlacing of zest and security which their troubled hearts, however audacious, seek most urgently.

The beginning of wisdom in this still dark field of speculation is the realization that stereotyped morality is the worst stumblingblock in the way of human happiness. Another bit of wisdom is the realization that the ideal of personal happiness has become so meaningful to the younger generation that no amount of preaching or bullying or tabooing on the part of the self-righteous elders of the race will avail one least little bit to stem the rising tide of happy experimentation in the love life. At all costs a new world of radiant men and women has decided to pursue happiness as the sweetest of life's gifts. By happiness these radiant men and women mean, very specifically, sexual happiness.

The gulf between sexual and marital love must somehow be bridged if marriage is to be honored and accepted by the younger generation. The intolerably oppressive responsibility which has been traditionally associated with marriage must be dissolved, pleasantly got rid of, before the wings of love can have free play for a really exuberant flight. The whole traditional hocus-pocus of conscience-stricken responsibility for the sex relation must be candidly cast out as so much baggage of intimidation, a load of horror that crushes the sweetness and natural beauty out of passion. Freedom, in a drastically free and wild sense, must genuinely flood our hearts as a thing both welcome and desirable, if we would taste anew the refreshment of love, the fulfillment of innocent, un-

burdened, irresponsible, shameless and devotional affection. Men and women will never know the maddening loveliness of sex until they have courageously cast aside the coercive weapons of obligation and duty and compulsion which rule marriage with an iron hand. Love must be radiantly free!

If you would know the whole evil indictment against marriage, simply remember that it is neither radiant nor free; it cannot be radiant because it is not free. No poet has ever written an ecstatic sonnet in celebration of conscription. May it not be the poets have with a crushing irony ignored marriage in their beautiful lyrics because marriage has been the cruelest of conscriptions? If the temptress, the siren, the shameful female, the scarlet woman, the courtesan, the street walker, the semi-reputable whore, if this interesting crew have ruled the hearts of men so persuasively (albeit so disastrously) for so very long a time, must we not candidly confess that there was something quite impossible for human nature to endure in that fixed, cramped, oppressive pattern of life called marriage?

If by the prostitute impulse we understand psychologically the anarchic desire of the heart to experience passion in unconventional and illegitimate ways, outside the familiar bonds and bounds of sacred routine, we shall understand with more tolerant minds and compassionate hearts the dark poetry of passion that flowers more luxuriantly in disreputable ecstasy than in respectable wedlock. Can marriage be as delightful as love? If it cannot, can it survive? If it survives, will it continue to be marriage in the old-fashioned sense? What is the future of marriage in a world that grows daily more youthful by accepting the blessings of spontaneity and sincerity?

It is worth while lingering a moment to consider again man's painful predicament in marriage. In his premarital careering, he had casually bunked into a variety of frankly disreputable females who carried on their bosoms the telltale sign: To let. These cheap experiences, never blest by his conscience, left in his mind what I shall call a prostitute complex.

This complex had as its lurid center the knowledge of sex as natural without stint, playful to the point of disreputability, shameless, joyously obscene, an experience to delight and degrade. Imagine the bafflement of the tainted spouse, now entered dutifully upon marriage, under a desperate compulsion to think of his wedded wife as pure, respectable, sober, hygienically fit to be the mother of his morally conceived children. The haunting problem of his passionate nights was how to continue to regard his mate as fundamentally different from the shameful females who stirred so uneasily in his unclean blood whenever he attempted to be natural and full-bodied in sex love. At all costs he must not encourage his wife to become acquainted with the candid truth about sex. He "kept" his wife pure in order to achieve the solace of a self-respect which prostitute indulgence had so cruelly marred. Under these tainted auspices, honorable marriage could not possibly be an experience of ecstasy, certainly not for the repressed and shamefaced woman who had to be on her good behavior lest a passion too exuberant and natural should debase her in the eyes of her sophisticated mate.

The by-products of this make-believe morality of marriage were syphilis, gonorrhea, miscarriage, female martyrdom, adultery, and male hypocrisy cloaking itself under the guise of necessity. The outstanding fact which

has brought respectable marriage into disrepute with the younger generation is the clear-cut knowledge of its incredibly unclean character. Women as the major victims of ignorance, blindness, and sentimental self-delusion have been quick to grasp the horror of the traditional situation. Hence the widespread experiments, beautifully initiated and supported by women, to ventilate the truths about venereal disease.

Women, half intuitively, half consciously, have decided to provide for obstreperous sex desire modes of appeasement that need not drag with them the shameful heritage of prostitute indulgence or the cruel predicament of venereal infection. But one really generous possibility was at hand for helping man solve the most perplexing problem of his life, to wit, the fulfillment of sex eagerness without the tragic accompaniments of shame and disease. No profounder problem has ever confronted human life.

A remarkable achievement toward which the sexes move with brave faltering steps is the candid consummation of the sex act without tragic potentials in the sequel. This accomplishment may well be ranked as the most spiritual in the history of sex because it represents in a new liberating sense the utter humanization of behavior. To love without shame or fear, in a high-hearted mood of dignity and beauty, is to make love in the way most congenial to civilized human beings. The civilizing of love is tantamount to the humanizing of passion. The beauty of passion, as contradistinguished from its pathology, resides in its healing power. This sweet appeasement, the very antithesis of the unsweet oppressiveness so often found in obligatory marital love, is possible only if the sexes honor passion as a force too won-

derful for the crude restraints of compulsion and conscription.

If prostitution as the commercialized ethic of "Bought and Paid For," as the cynic philosophy of "Pay As You Enter," is fading out of the landscape of life, let us generously thank an enlightened younger generation of men and women who are weary of pretense and hypocrisy and silly shame, dedicated anew to the ideal of candor and beauty in the relation of the sexes, resolved to cleanse the ancient stream of desire of its unclean residuals, scientifically prepared to accept the reality of sex as a great good, let the obscene moralists say what they will. If prostitution is dying, it is because love as radiant passion is being reborn.

We have come through our disillusion with so-called romantic and idealistic marriage. Ibsen has marvelously dramatized this disillusion, for those who have the courage to understand. The idealistic phase of marriage which trailed most ingloriously the deepening shadow of syphilisation may be looked upon as the pathology of love. From idealist illusion through realist disillusion we finally enter the stage of realization. Thanks to the noble works of enlightenment of poetic minds like Carpenter, Key, Ellis, we appreciate with an exquisite tenderness, buttressed by a scientific candor, the fine potentialities resident in sex love, once it has been purged of the pathology of shame and disease. This neo-realistic phase of sex enlightenment we may refer to as the psychology of love, its civilization. From syphilisation to civilization marks the whole span of the emancipation of sex desire from unclean idealism to clean realism. We are on the threshold of a happier world, more varied, more

beautiful, more new, in the intimate relations of the sexes.

A historian of sex would see the underlying facts as follows: the economic servility of woman in conventional marriage; the absorption of her sex and personality in the drudgery of fecundity; the theologic influence and demoralization of sexual shame; the insidious dual attitude of man involving the costly contradiction between the status of his wife on the one hand, as respectable and therefore passionless, and the attribution on the other hand, to the passionate and shameless, and therefore disreputable female, of the epithet of whore; the wide prevalence of erotic ignorance; the obsessive emphasis on the obligations of parenthood to the eventual ruin of the rights of sex love; the social conception of marriage as a compulsion imposed by external forces assuming the majesty and grandeur of a fate against the rigors of which mere human will is impotent: the inevitable extinguishment of erotic delight in the arms of sacred marital routine;—these are the pivotal realities that have underlain and finally undermined traditional marriage.

Now we may ask and try to answer our original question as to whether prostitution, as an institutional device for sex fulfillment rivaling marriage in importance, is petering out?

What new factors are to be taken account of in a drastically modern theory of sex behavior? The key reality is of course the spreading knowledge of the control of fecundity. This central fact constitutes a complete revolution in sexual ethics and in personal philosophy. Everything significant and perturbing in the contemporary world is traceable to the accessibility of the knowl-

edge of "birth control." The momentous corollary of this new knowledge is the conscious subordination of reproduction to sex love, in and out of the marital relation.

I am not aware that any writer on these themes has sufficiently clarified for himself and his readers the ramifying consequences of this geologic shift in the center of gravity from procreation to recreation as the true goal of sex expression. Not only has old-fashioned sacred behavior been turned topsy-turvy in favor of a thoroughly new-fashioned profane deportment, but solemn obligation and ceremonial awe have been rather ruthlessly cast aside as mere impediments to the joy of living, a gospel of casual felicity that has seized upon the imagination of modern youth with the binding power of a religion.

Other novel features in the situation are the sudden happy realization on the part of woman that she possesses sexual personality; the increasing thoughtful reliance on the technique of prevenception as a reliable and splendid neutralizer of fear and shame; a pagan renaissance in the long tabooed field of natural self-expression; the creation of a new concept of dignity as attaching in the nature of things to sex expression; the general failure and futility of large abstract ideals that somehow succeeded in asphyxiating and sterilizing human nature, with the consequent reaction in favor of a régime of private pleasures and consolations that shall compensate for existence daily without any unendurable waiting for utopia; and finally, the realization that the only present live option to old style marriage without love is new style love without marriage. These transforming forces are re-creating our human universe and

giving us an experimental approach to reality which in essence is both scientific and humanistic.

In concrete practice, civilized promiscuity is building sanctions for itself that promise ere long to afford enlightened men and women that pluralistic philosophy of behavior which has invaded every department of modern life. It is this pluralism in the realm of sex that is inexorably recasting the sacred routine of conventional marriage and as inevitably refashioning the vagrant behavior of a clandestine and prostitute variety: hitherto the two major types of permissible sex expression.

If freedom in love, admittedly a perilous experiment with the life force, can even partially succeed in liberalizing and humanizing marriage, if it can cancel out of existence low prostitute relations by giving sex love, however consummated, the status of a dignified and significant experience without shame or fear or tragic complication, then we must generously acknowledge the coming-true of a very great dream indeed, the dream of a world filled with the beauty of sex love, a world in which for the first time in human life men and women will honor the passion and the pain in one another's delighted bodies as a thing of infinite worth and loveliness.

Is prostitution petering out? Almost every wise student in this field thinks so. Speaking statistically, no one knows. Speaking morally, we may intelligently guess that every wise student is right. Speaking psychologically, there can be no doubt that prostitution as a commercialized method of fulfilling sex desire is wonderfully on the wane.

What has happened is startlingly interesting. Our reputable girls have taken a leaf out of the unprintable diary of the prostitute and have with brazen courage

equipped themselves with the tricks and technics and modes of self-display which belong by long historic right to the "filles de joie," whom H. G. Wells once graphically referred to as the "painted disasters of the street." One need not be a cynic but only a realistic analyst to remark that the latter-day painted disasters of the street include such nice people as our daughters, sisters, sweethearts, wives, and intimate lady-friends.

By the weirdest of ironies the triumph of the whore marks the downfall of prostitution.

Such a powerful statement is liable to misunderstanding. Only a subtle psychological conception of human behavior, including in the nature of the case human misbehavior, can fathom the full-fledged significance of so fundamental a proposition. Speaking psycho-sexually, the triumph of the whore means nothing more perturbing than the incorporation into the technique of reputable deportment of the spontaneity, natural candor, appreciation of sensuality, love of body exhibitionism, a certain innocent self-display, which we suffocated moralists of the race have, to the unspeakable detriment of life and love, ungraciously attributed as hall-marks of evil to those happier and more lighthearted women, the charming and tempting females endowed with passion and piquancy.

Out of our pathologic fear and distorted shame we have ignobly branded these gay women, these lure-women, with epithets of ignominy which in sober truth revealed our own frustrated state of heart much more than they symbolized the degradation of the creatures whom we were morally bound to despise, lest, despising them not, we might in an all-too-human moment reveal how much we might love them.

We are no longer ashamed to acknowledge that love to be rich and deep must be intimately nurtured by lust. The new experiment of the ages is a simple and wonderful one: to give our happy and radiant lust to the reputable female of the species and thus to achieve two miracles at a stroke: to sexualize love, more particularly married love, and to cancel out of human existence the unclean reality of sneak prostitution. When love and lust learn to embrace in beauty and harmony, the joy of men and women in each other will have become a radiant reality guaranteeing the exquisite fulfillment of what their unashamed hearts desire.

It is old doctrine and yet so new as to be strange and incredible that girls are eager to be loved—as well as to be married.

So many foolish and cruel things have been said and thought about freedom in love and about so-called free lovers (I suppose those who are harnessed in marriage might be called, with a certain scientific objectivity, fettered lovers), we can afford at this late day to pay a magnanimous tribute to those courageous pioneers in sex enlightenment and erotic emancipation who as philosophers and personal participants gave to life new patterns of fulfillment, novel modes of self-realization.

It is shameful how viciously we treat the iconoclasts, the pioneers, the originals: we torture them because they dare to make us painfully conscious of our imperfections, our empty hypocrisies and self-deluding idealisms. The torture we impose upon our superiors is a measure, psychopathologically, of our great need of their unbearably enlightening guidance. We too would live a more abundant life; we have neither the clarity of vision nor the

courage of will to undertake that more precious way of living.

To hide from our own half-seeing eyes the brilliant possibilities of a more liberating way of living, we not only crucify the creative souls, we meanly delay the humanization of existence. But, in due time, our passion for venting our inferiority upon scapegoats is spent, we experience a calmer mood of reluctant reflection, we think twice before condemning too harshly those who live by a more flexible philosophy, a more generous emotionality. Thus it felicitously comes to pass that even the more mediocre minds are touched with the radiance of the new vision and with pathetic inadequacy grope toward a more conscious conception of life.

Freedom in love is without question the most perilous of adventures, the most beautiful and poignant and desperate of experiences. But not for that reason must we darken the vision of those who are capable of living more freely, by an inner law of orientation.

To the courageous experimentalists in sex we of the tribe of conventional cowards owe a generous tribute of admiration and appreciation. Their painful wrestling with life has given us the courage to think of sex and love and marriage more critically, more sincerely, more nobly.

Sex love is the sweetest reality in the living universe. Why do we degrade love and life by denying to sex the privileges it so richly merits?

## Chapter VI

# PROBLEMS OF THE SEXES

Sex knowledge before marriage is usually fragmentary and foolish and frightening. It is neither scientifically illuminating nor poetically inspiring. The very first rational prerequisite to marriage is surely a knowledge of sex at once intimate, specific, candid and deep. A knowledge we all woefully lack. Why? Because of shame and ignorance. Shame is that complex of attitudes, inhibitory and yet provocative, which prevents us from looking upon our bodies (especially the sexual parts) with that ease and lighthearted approval we are wont to give to our minds. Ignorance is that slowly eradicable quality of the mind which sees in knowledge hindrance rather than amelioration, in life the operation of the law of chance, in behavior the principle of luck, in reason a burdensome self-consciousness, in "naturalness" the true joy of living. What is the meaning of shame, sexual shame more particularly?

Speaking psychologically, civilization represents the dominance of Pretence in society. The ascendancy of pretence as the true differentia of civilized society springs from a series of assumptions rooting in a denial of the "animal" nature of man (and woman). Civilized man builds up a mind full of beliefs taking the shape, psychically, of a pyramid at the glowing apex of which shines his faith in his Godliness. A God through fateful folly fallen from grace!

Man's naïve egotism working on the silken assumptions of idealism (self-love collaborating with self-delusion) creates the iridescent patterns of pretence which he proceeds to honor and even to worship as the finely spun raiment of his soul. Pretence is the delicately woven veil through which the mind of man glimpses reality.

The pretence-laden mind is happiest in the company of ideals, ideals that caress it and kiss it reassuringly, for ideals are the loving offspring of its make-believe nature (self-love wedded to self-delusion). The most glorious of the mind's pretences is the belief in a divinity, alien to all crawling creatures but *homo,* fashioned by God's immaculate hands to raise man in spiritual stature above all other living beings. Man thinks of himself as descended from God, not as ascended from Beast.

Man seriously believes that he is essentially mind and soul and only incidentally body and flesh. To protect his make-believe mind from the disillusioning knowledge of his true indelible nature, man draws the veil of pretence discreetly over the coarser self and revels obscurely in the delights of self-love and self-delusion. What facts most particularly cut athwart his make-believe nature? All those facts inseparable from his animal nature. He discovers in himself aspects, functions, behaviors, crises, desires, astonishingly akin to the construction and the conduct he notes (to his disgust!) in animals. A shatteringly ironic and bitterly disillusioning identity! Man cannot wholly hide from his deluded mind the truth about his animal nature.

Hence the origin of shame, the emotion that stains the make-believe mind with a perturbing consciousness of the *contradiction* between pretence and reality. Con-

sciousness (which lives fitfully in a sort of twilight sleep) suddenly "registers" shame when the behavior of the animal nature has *come into conflict* with the idealistic assumptions of the pretence nature. Specifically, in matters of sex, the make-believe mind is "shocked," feels shame, when it has been made conscious of the contradiction between its actual desire and its idealistic pretence. The "Beast" has broken loose and trodden upon the "God" in human nature. For shame!

We are ashamed to be human, for being human makes us too keenly aware that we are animal. We are ashamed to be animal. Why? Man will not accept the fact that his animal nature is as real as his human nature. He idealizes his human nature and calls it divine, he disparages his animal nature and calls it beastly. . . . Perhaps the psychological motive for this cleavage arises from man's recurring need to behave in a beastly manner and from his understandable desire to escape the torture pangs of conscience in the sobering sequel. Thus, by this duality, the God-pretence remains unsoiled and innocently intact while the brute-reality may go "on the loose" and indulge its carnal self, giddily roll in the mire of sensuality and dirty itself to its heart's content, so to speak, without feeling either the sting of compunction or the eating pains of remorse. Man appears to get along best when his pretences and his desires remain utter strangers to one another. He enjoys being a beast and he also enjoys pretending that he is a God. Animal and man are in this wise strangely reconciled and learn to enjoy a precarious peace in their common habitat, Human Nature. . . .

The youth pretends that his love is wholly idealistic. The maiden pretends that her love is wholly innocent.

Both pretend that they love one another spiritually, platonically. They feel that their love is pure, that is, sexless. The ominous cleavage between purity and sexuality is nurtured in that youthful period of inexperience when dream-desire begets its immaculate conceptions in the theoretic mind and the body's subtle quiescence has not yet been perturbed by contact with maculate desire. Shame plays its cunning part, too, in this edifying comedy of Hide and Seek. If at the very dawn of desire, in quick response to the delicious urge of sex-consciousness, youth and maiden yielded directly and unceremoniously to the promptings of love and sought each other for the experience of sexual intercourse, we should confront a species of behavior that wounds civilization in its most vulnerable spot, for the very essence of civilized behavior is make-believe. Young men and young women, in the first flush of sexual awakening, seeking to realize, without much ado, in sexual intercourse, the precise meaning of their dream desires would be looked *down* upon as wicked, unnatural, immoral, uncivilized, unchaste, impure, shameful, disgraceful, God-damned creatures. Since the impulse (linked to dream desire), to taste sexual experience roams restlessly in the mind of youth and maiden at an age decreed by civilization's censors of morals as too young for practical fulfillment, the query forces itself upon us: By what psychologic device is the period of restless longing between puberty and marriage held in leash,—shunted, sterilized, tabooed, sublimated, repressed, "civilized" out of its natural vigor and potency,—so that we actually come to believe that the love of young men and young women is *pure?* The psychologic device by means of which our

animal natures are transformed into civilized natures is shame!

Speaking sexually, shame is the most vital (and indispensable) element in the life of make-believe. The essence of civilized behavior is pretence. Modesty in a young woman is the pretence that she does not wish to be made love to sexually (realistically) but only dreamily (innocently, romantically). Decency in a young man is the pretence that he does not desire a woman sexually but only platonically. Purity in young women and young men is the pretence, vital and sincere, that they do not so much desire one another for sexual intercourse as for having a little fun, innocently, playing at brother and sister, playing with fire, being "pals," just having a "good" time.

The powerful negation which helps, by the subtlest of coercions, to guy young men and young women into the conviction that pretence is more real than reality,—experience in love and marriage discloses the *real* truth! —is the taboo on life erected by the ethic of shame. The shameful education of youths and maidens, in a conventionally-civilized society, compels a behavior on the part of the awakening sexes that favors a sort of "beating about the bush," *sexcitement* up to a certain point (of honor), coquetry within the limits of "modesty," love's tentatives experimentally in the throes of sexual reality, civilization sagely counseling Virgins: Don't go too far. Don't compromise your "honor"—until, by gradual process of surrender and abasement, *human nature succumbing to animal nature,* the naked truth about their deep desires is revealed to youths and maidens too violently, too overwhelmingly to be denied. The civilized emotion of shame permits enough time, for the sake of

psychologic readjustment, to elapse between the dawn of desire and the eclipse of pretence to save the mind (largely a creation of make-believe) from too abrupt a confrontation of the truth about itself, namely, that the life of sex cannot thrive unless animal nature is welcomed as enthusiastically as human nature. Nor can the mating of the sexes nor the unfoldment of love in marriage be greatly realized unless *the process of de-civilization* shall have gone far enough to permit human nature and animal nature to lie down together in a bed of love and feel radiantly happy and at peace with one another. . . . Love is poisoned by shame.

If we consult our own unaffrighted fundamental natures, we do not feel this guilty shame; on the contrary, we are a little startled by the sense of a liberating shamelessness, in our innermost minds quite assured that our natures could be happy if they were not shadowed at every step by that guilty thing called shame. Not the act we dream or desire or contrive that truly shames us but only the intangible oppressive something that hovers darkly over our most secret longings, denying them the life-giving adventure they so urgently seek. It is shame and shame alone that makes us feel so ashamed. We are ashamed, in truth, of shame!

Since the special animal characteristics are bound up, in the shame-full mind, with sex organs and sex functions, by a strange, almost weird paradox, the sex organs in man are thought of as inherently excremental (animal attribute) and inherently sacramental (divinely-human attribute!). Sex is both disgusting and exhilarating, low and yet somehow sublime, shameful yet strangely beautiful, an experience to deny as trivial and yet one worth crying one's heart out for, an unclean thing but for all

that an ever fresh miracle. Sex is lust, sex is love; sex is unclean, sex is holy; sex is the profound mystery of nothing; sex is the profound mystery of everything; sex is a curse, sex is a blessing; sex is a madness, sex is a rejuvenation; sex is evil, sex is good! Sex the dark magic of the universe!

Before all else, if marriage is to be something of a joy and a blessing, it is needful to divest our civilized minds of the superstitious pretenses that lend so gruesome a vitality to the ethic of shame. Men and women who would be happy in marriage, that is, in sexual love, must be shameless—and tender. The civilized worship of shame serves the cool and calculating and life-denying purpose of preventing mature men and women from tasting to the full the beauty of their sexual love. Love to be sweet must be shameless.

Pain and pleasure, joy and sorrow, delight and sadness, happiness and misery, light and dark, good and evil, heaven and hell, God and Satan, are the dramatic antitheses that compose the drama of our mortal life.

Strange things transpire in a strange world. The meaning, the zest, the tang, the fathomable mystery of experience is revealed to those alone who have the courage to die in order that they may truly live. "Stirb und werde." Life bids us destroy ourselves if we would know how to *live*. Only those who can suffer may know heaven and hell. We live by the law of dramatic contrasts. We feel joy the more keenly when we have known sorrow too. Paradox is the essence of life, the magic key to the secrets of the universe, its joys, its laws, its miracles, its pains, its cruel comedy and its sublime tragedy. All true birth is a rebirth. Life is not truly life until we have learned how to live! We cannot live the life of sex until

we have learned how to love the sex of life. Sex experience is primarily a participation in the crises of life: the crises of disillusionment, though not, necessarily, of disenchantment, accompanying love's pained and passion-perturbed realizations. Love, the divine illusion, is born, or rather reborn, in the crisis of experience, in the pangs of disillusion. Whether it be the crisis of conception or birth or puberty or adolescence or love's awakening or virginal experience or marriage or adultery, love is the most baffling of paradoxes, the cunningest contriver of illusion and disillusion inextricably interwoven. Love is the saddest of joys, the most pleasurable of pains, the sublimest of follies, the most vital of weaknesses, the most astonishing of commonplaces, the most elusive of realities, the most romantic of realisms, the most soulful of sensualities, the most egotistic of self-effacements, —the paradox of paradoxes: illusion hugging disillusion in a most incestuous embrace, disillusion rapturously wooing enchantment, enchantment kissing a fond farewell to dream-desire, love triumphant over all. The maddest of paradoxes!

And thus it comes to pass that a true initiation into the mysteries of experience implies and requires that confrontation of illusion with reality which spells disillusion, but not disenchantment! . . . Would a maiden truly know the reality of her dream desire for love? Then she must consent to have her illusion of innocence tarnished by virile contact with male carnality. Does the passion-haunted virgin long to know the reality of marriage? Then she must learn with gladness to cast aside the dark veils of illusion that guard her honor and courageously yield herself to the drastic process of sexual awakening. And when she learns to understand that her

sacrifices of innocence and purity and virginity and modesty are all for the greater glory of her womanhood, her body's perfection and her soul's release, she will honor the sexual gifts of life as richer in vital meanings, profounder and dearer, than the reverie-woven dream desire of the age of innocence.

To sacrifice all for love is the deepest impulse of exalted bodies, of dreaming minds. For the uncertain days of our childhood, fairy tales may be a consolation and a source of spiritual strength. But when our full-orbed maturity makes known to our dream minds the throb and mighty rhythm and eloquent tide of our own unobscure desires, fairy tales will no longer appease the eager and irresistible mind. A nameless longing after a truer knowledge of the buried life—the lyric passions and the maddening hungers of sex—stirs in our beings and we crave to feel and taste and probe the imagined wonders of love, of sexual love. In such a radiant mood, Passion proudly casts aside its virginal habiliments, stands forth in its beauteous nudity and proffers with lavish gesture and mind-easing grace the incredible wonder-shaping gift of love. In that incredible wonder-shaping gift of love, all honors and virginities and purities and modesties and innocencies and dream desires are recreated anew, their true renascence and their second blooming exquisitely consummated in passion's precious coming-true.

All love in which remembered innocence is, blesses life.

The beasts of the field are not ashamed. Shall man, greater than these, dishonor sex by inculcating the poison ethic of shame? Shame is a crime against love. Cruelty is shameful, and pettiness and deceit. But Love—Sex—Desire—Passion—these are not shameful (though our

dishonorable attitude toward them may be), unless the most wonderful gifts Nature has bestowed upon Man are to be desecrated because of a crack-brained cleavage which sets the seal of dishonor upon man's animal nature and by dramatic contrast deifies his human nature.

Observe how shame darkens love and life at every turn. We are all sentimental enough to feel a lyrical kinship with young lovers radiantly happy in each other's presence. What magic power holds these lovers in its awful spell? Love, we charmingly say, and by silence and evasion shy at the whole truth of the matter. May we not, as charmingly, say sexual love, and thus in two wondrous-potent words reveal the truth and beauty that irradiate life when sex inspires love and love exalts sex,—as lovers do sweetly testify? Would a woman feel it a tribute to her womanhood if her vital presence failed to stir sexual desire in her lover? Would it honor his manhood for a lover to realize that his wooing and male ardor failed to evoke sexual longing in his beloved? If we are honest lovers does it not secretly delight us to know how strange and potent a magic we may exercise upon one another, the omnipotent magic of sexual attraction? The complicated wonder and fascination of sexuality in man the lover and in woman the beloved is the most curious and awe-inspiring and tantalizing of phenomena. To be ashamed of such miraculous phenomena is appropriate feeling for simpletons and vulgarians, not for radiant men and women who honor the life of sex because love is infinitely lovable. Shame darkens life and love. Let there be light! The light of sexual love, shameless and candor-white and beautifully free!

The beloved woman is not, in her deepest self, ashamed

of her sex, her sex organs, her sex emotions, her sex moods, her sex urges, her sex dreams:—her magnificently sensuous and stirred young womanhood. She is delighted and secretly enchanted. Her senses are entranced. She moves happily as in a dream, spellbound and awed, love-laden. Nor is her lover, if he truly love, ashamed (in his deepest self) of his sex, his sex organs, his sex emotions, his sex moods, his sex urges, his sex dreams:—his magnificently sexual and passion-perturbed young manhood. He is intoxicated and secretly bewitched. His senses are quickened and exhilarated. He moves buoyantly as in a reverie, fascinated, hypnotized, dream-haunted. He is madly in love with life. As she is madly in love with love. Lover and Beloved entranced with the incredible relations of sex. The blessed birth of Sex Love!

Youth has its virtuous pretenses, its make-believe innocences that are shattered, of course, in marriage which makes a gay mockery of shame and modesty and morality. Youth, restive under protective pretenses, is secretly suspicious of the practices and privileges of the married folk. His pretenses are "moral". His desires "immoral". Noble distraught youth!

How can a youth come into marriage with a clean ecstatic mind if his imaginings and private ponderings have all been defiled with alternating moods of fascination and shame as if he too, like the multitudinous vulgarians, thought sexual love sinful, a commerce of lusts, a dark compromise, a sullied indulgence. We must somehow contrive an education (a reëducation) in sex that will dissolve youth's impulses toward vulgarity and low-thoughted suspicion and cynic interpretation, in a poetical-mystic conception of the love life sufficiently inspir-

ing to redeem sex from the contamination of prurience and pettiness.

The youth, still sex-shy and morbidly self-conscious, in the grip of a fascination that frightens, emotionally disquiescent, intellectually eager for a knowledge of the buried life, physically sensitive to sexual suggestion, pretending (and so heroically!) to be superior to love and desire, yet privately engaged in a struggle with a turbulent sex consciousness, cynically "wise" and oh how emotionally illiterate,—modern youth cannot make his peace with the madly sensational world that whirls tumultuously in and all about him. A drunken chaos! Why expect youth to remain sober when life itself is almost constantly drunk?

Since no one whom he can look up to with respect or think of with honor has taught him—strangely enough, such knowledge does not come *naturally* in a civilized society!—to view with admiration and reverence and pride the curious cluster of sex organs that burn their meaning so unforgettably into his mind, what attitude is he to assume toward the central problem of his life? What must be hidden and shamefully cloaked and not even alluded to above a snickering whisper must indeed be sinister and of evil import. If youth is sexually ashamed of himself, can he look with eyes of lucid loveliness upon life, upon the intimate life of man and woman?

The weirdest notions drag their dirty and disheartening trails through the passion-curious mind of youth. He has overheard coarse hints about the sexual intimacy (which his dream mind has idealized out of natural existence), how the man "breaks the woman's maiden" and how the bed is stained with blood. His uncomprehend-

ing heart grows sick with the unbelievable knowledge. He can't imagine how any but callous, unspeakable men can inflict such pain upon women, in love. He imagines in his terror-stricken vision of sexual love that he can hear women weeping, their virginal bodies assaulted by men bereft of mercy, obsessed by lust. He cannot cleanse his bruised mind of the most painful and haunting imagery. Sexual love frightens and nauseates his brooding mind. His sentimental heart goes out in a truly maternal pity to the woman in marriage. The man he thinks of as a dirty brute. He sees life—the life of the sexes—as a shameful thing, low and secret and unclean.

Precisely with notions and emotions as weird and fantastic as these does the mind of awakening youth struggle toward knowledge and wisdom. The adolescent observation that so many persons do marry—including some very nice ones—and somehow learn to accept the baptismal initiation into married life, (the ceremonial of fire and blood) brings him a sort of solace. Perhaps the pain is not so terrible if the man is very loving and gentle! But the "breaking of the maiden" and the bleeding! How can one's lyrical conception of love mate with that hospital reality? How can an exquisite-hearted lover come to the marriage bed prepared to wound with masculine raw surgery the enchanting body of his bride? . . .

Many a radiant-thoughted youth has racked his uncomprehending brain for years in a futile attempt to understand the dark riddle of sexual love. He ponders dimly on many queer puzzling problems of the life sexual. Obscurely he gradually comprehends this and that bit of forbidden knowledge. He gropes through a twilight zone of doubt and distress toward the light,—

where his Dream is. A light that is often more lurid than luminous. How desperately, almost pathetically, does youth seek knowledge and wisdom! Can't youth be taught to accept his sex more sweetly? More proudly and more reverently? The wonderful phenomena of his sexuality, wonderful as science, as poetry, as mysticism, are love-worthy! His body is lovable, his young manhood inspiring, his sexual yearning the source of poetry and dream and gentleness, the delicious consciousness of sex organs the first strange glimpse into the meaning of life, the recurrent manifestations of sex-potency in troubling but none the less significant and exhilarating erections, in nocturnal emissions (hideously alluded to as "pollutions"), in radiant impulses to sexual intercourse, psychically experienced with the most uncanny, dream-like delight as though the holiest of life's mysteries were unfolding in an almost celestial loveliness before one's dancing senses, are all unutterably dear and telltale revelations of the blossoming of sex love, youth embracing life. Sex love is the supreme miracle of existence.

And so, too, must the maiden be taught to honor her sex, the delight of man, the glory of the universe. There is too much wonder in the sex of woman for her to mar its beauty with ignoble shame. Let her remember that every process her beloved body knows fascinates man, deepens and inspires. The dark mystery of her menstrual flow, the birth of passion in the heart of innocence, the sweet irresistible allure of her sex organs, the bright beauty of her breasts, rapturous with life, the exquisite bloom of her womanhood, radiant and shy as emergent dawn, the liquid loveliness of grace that shapes her body's voluptuous form, the passionate female stir, the ecstasy that broods so hauntingly in her being—all, all

are dear, inexpressibly dear, life's most precious jewels. The light of the universe! Will it sound strange doctrine to untutored ears to be told that man and woman will never know the blessing and the beauty of sexual love,—the incomparable joy of loving each other divinely, to heart's content,—until they have experienced the thrill, *the creative joy of self-love?* The man honoring and reverencing and loving his own sexuality, the woman worshipping and sweetening and beautifying her sexuality, *sexually delighted with themselves,* man and woman are radiantly ready to love one another exquisitely, passionately, beautifully. Beautifully!

In the intense months before the time of marriage what could be wiser—and lovelier—than for the radiant lovers to take that briefer voyage of discovery into the mysteries of their wedded life by the revelations of which they may feel great-heartedly equipped to voyage in more perilous seas and learn to meditate strange events never glimpsed before, mysteries and dark miracles only married lovers may know.

How much wiser for lovers on the threshold of marriage to devote themselves to enhanced knowledge of sex, to a deeper understanding of sexual love, than to spend their precious energies so lavishly in largely futile and excessively painful love-play that issues in nothing more illuminating for the male than the torture-sense of burning brands consuming the nervous system (the sex organs sick with a suffocating pain of misery and frustration) and for the female a crushed and crying sense of desire unattainable, of passion in pain, sex organs tumescent and hungry but pathetically deprived of the sweet fruit of fulfillment.

Better far to spend their erotic leisure in candid discus-

sion of sex, its evolution, its embryology, its male and female history, its normalities and abnormalities, its pains and pleasures, its problems and bafflements, its science and poetry; love as life, its good and evil, its wisdom and folly. Love as Religion. Love as Art. There is so much to learn about sex and passion and love and marriage.

What period more appropriate to a profound garnering of the insights that irradiate the erotic life than the period prior to marriage, "normally" spent in desperate blind lovemaking, in sexual wear and tear, in playing the melodramatic game of hide-and-seek, in a foolish frittering away of love's sublimity. Folly twice confounded.

Candid conversations before marriage would encompass such vital themes as: the nature of desire in man and in woman; the physiology and the psychology of love; the whole complex problem of shame; the relation between Nature and Art in the realm of Sex; the erotic experiences of adolescent boys and girls; love affairs, imaginary and real; sexual reverie and dreams; personal hopes and fears; autobiographic sex history; analysis of the civilized conflict between mind and body; difficulties in the way of sexual felicity; the differing values embodied in marriage, in free love, in prostitution; woman's part in marriage, man's contribution; discussion of divorce, adultery, infidelity, freedom in marriage, sexual love in its more modern moods and experiments; the correlation of human nature and sexual love; birth control and babies; the marital disharmonies; the finer potentialities of married love inspired by a philosophy of candor and freedom and friendship; the magic of sex; love as procreation, love as recreation; love as dream, love as illusion and disillusion;—Sex, Sex Organs, Passion, De-

sire, Love, Sexual Intimacy, Marriage—what wonderfully stirring themes for men and women brimming with desire for each other, on the threshold of marriage.

Many a bright and instructive hour can be spent in the reading and discussion (autobiographic reminiscence lending inspiration and clarity to the discourse) of the great sexual texts such as those of Forel, Ellis, Stopes, Robie, Long, Hess, Robinson, Hall, et al., to mention only a courageous and mind-awakening few. Happy the lovers who possess the good sense and the fine audacity to delve into the vast enlightening subject-matter of sex with minds single to the acquisition of profounder knowledge and wisdom, all for the sweetening and deepening of their wedded love life. To rub from their eyes the ignorant scales of illusion that becloud true vision, to see with astonishing lucidity into the very deeps of the sexual nature, to achieve knowledge without suffering the disquietude of disillusion, to attain wisdom without forfeiting a vision of beauty, these are the prerequisites of sexual enlightenment, the forerunners of erotic adequacy. The pre-marital period should be a time of wonderful knowledge and winged wisdom: a genuine initiation of the eager lovers into the mysteries of the erotic life.

Nor need it be emphasized that the crowning *realization* of what the life sexual really is cannot arrive until marriage has been consummated! What has already been said in so many intense pages concerning the illusions and disillusions of lovers in wedlock hints at one conspicuous need the acquirement of which may give love's radiant illusions a chance to triumph, for a longer period, the illiterate indifference to which may speedily help marriage's dark disillusions to triumph but too

ignobly. The one conspicuous need of married lovers is a thoroughgoing acquaintance with that psycho-sexual behavior which takes its origin in genital desire, functions through a *technic,* and blossoms (if it does not wither) in an art of love. More succinctly, we shall refer to the total procedure as The Art of Loving, and dwell upon its most significant aspect: *Technic for Lovers.*

It is doubtful if anyone can speak wisely about sexual behavior unless he has an acute sense for the psychologic realities, including the illusions, of human natures. Perhaps it is because they do not possess psychologic insight that so many medical doctors, otherwise so well-intentioned and amiable, proffer such ineffectual advice to brides and bridegrooms, especially the latter who are usually counseled by a good friend to visit a physician before starting out on the momentous honeymoon,—urgently in need of *information and insight.* What the married lovers need is quite as much psychologic wisdom as physiologic knowledge. Physiologic knowledge,—for example, the "mechanics" of the sex act,—has no automatic way of applying itself with magical effect to the new sexual life, but psychologic wisdom,—for example, an insight into the initial mental difficulties in the way of sexual fulfillment,—does yield powerful light on the sexual process in its relation to *human nature as a whole.* And the starting point for genuine analysis and enlightenment in the complex problems of human behavior is proper appreciation of the psychologic (the *psychosexual*) factors involved in an understanding of human nature in its totality.

The following discussion of Technic for Novices is an attempt to coördinate all the vitally relevant aspects

of human nature as it functions in the sex relation. The object of such a psycho-sexual treatment of the "Art of Loving" will be the purely pragmatic one of making it more possible for married lovers to practise sexual love more felicitously, more wisely.

Why is it that we moderns are almost unanimous in the conviction that knowledge is a better guide to happiness, if not always to virtue, than ignorance can be? Why have we forsaken the old-fashioned belief that innocence in a girl before marriage is the beginning of wisdom in matters sexual? Why the latter-day devotion, almost religious in its fanatic intensity to knowledge, truth, disillusion, candor, insight? Why do we feel, albeit our hearts with the new realization are pained, that ignorance is the most disastrous lack the young mind can suffer in an age as open-eyed and sophisticated and brusquely realistic as ours? If we have perforce accepted the wisdom of Disillusion as the safer guide to life in a world such as flesh and blood is heir to, the reason is overwhelmingly cogent and simple; we have found the wisdom wrought by Illusions terrifyingly inadequate and misleading. The Age of Innocence is gone for good! Ours is the Age of Realization. Lest we forget, let it be once more retold, disillusion is not disenchantment. Our faith in life and in love still flourishes, a faith built upon a knowledge of realities, not as of old upon evasion and concealment and eloquent ignorance.

Imagine the plight of the young woman, and of the young man, for that matter, untutored in sexual reality entering into marriage and having to encounter the shock and stress and strain of sexual intimacies? Unimaginative cruel ignorance could devise no punishment more painful than for *human nature* to have to undergo, over-

night as it were, a revolutionary and incomprehensibly drastic change in its habits of feeling, believing, thinking. No wonder the wedding night has become associated in so many sex-haunted young minds with the violence appropriate to rape. A hideous travesty of innocence!

Does it not appear to be the essence of good sense, psychologically-and-sexually, to make the marital experience as continuous with the pre-marital state as it is erotically possible to do? Even in our enlightened age, relatively speaking, the botches and blunders incidental to marriage are a woeful evidence of the vast erotic illiteracy still characteristic of the sexes. The plunge from virginity into marriage is far too blind and precipitous. The leap from a state of neurotic repression to a state of nervous expression is far too violent and foolhardy. This emotional violence may be a tribute to the ardent passion of the lover but it is a pretty plain commentary on the artlessness of love. Folly and futility!

Look upon woman. How prodigally Nature has endowed her with sexuality. From the crown of her head to the tips of her toes Woman is palpitant with sex. The very menstrual process, coming to her almost in her childhood, makes her aware of her destiny as crucially dependent upon Sex. In early adolescence the chemic transfiguration of her body acquaints her with the charming attributes of breasts and alluring shapeliness. She can't help falling in love with herself, so brimful of new life is she. Exquisite auto-eroticism! She seeks the admiration of men, in her disquieting innocence, because she knows instinctively that love, fluttering sex love, is the precious magic which alone can make her shy girl-

hood blossom beauteously into womanhood. Woman is sex. Love enchants her mind. Love is her religion. Her body is freighted with erogenous zones. Love can stir her in so many delicious-perilous ways. Imagine how beautifully equipped her body is to receive and to sense almost deliriously the delights of sexual intercourse. Her lover spends himself like a hero in her behalf. He literally confers upon her the magic gift of love's realization. In the sex act the passion and the splendor and the fire and the erotic potency are all displayed wondrously for her sake. Woman is Life's favorite sex. Woman knows the fulness of love. Woman feels the beauty of Passion. Love-laden female!

In the light of these astonishing facts, would it not seem a thing inevitable for woman to leap delightedly to the call of sexual love? To yield her body ecstatically in marriage? To desire with her soul's keenest ardor the passionate experience of sexual intercourse? Her breasts know bliss when they are exquisitely kissed. Her body chuckles with gladness when it feels the soothing caresses wrought by magic male manipulation. Her sex sings with delight when it feels the glowing contact of the lover contriving ecstasy. In sexual love the woman is constantly receiving. All her awakened senses are flooded with life. Her body is filled with sweet passion. Little fires of ecstasy are lit in her happy brain. In the light of these astonishing facts, would it not seem a thing inevitable for woman to leap delightedly to the call of sexual love? To yield her body ecstatically in marriage? To desire with her soul's keenest ardor the passionate experience of sexual intercourse? Does she? And if she does not, is it wholly due to the inadequacy of her lover in the art of loving? May it not be due

rather to a deep division in the modern woman soul which makes it well nigh impossible for her to use the sexual endowments of her marvelously erotic nature for the sweet fulfillment of sexual desire? Is modern woman profoundly capable of enjoying sexual intercourse?

Why is woman,—in marriage,—so little stimulating sexually?

The theme is too large to pursue in detail. A few vitally relevant considerations may be cited, however. The shutting off of the reproductive (racial) impulse *may* have induced in the womb of the modern woman a species of lethargy that organically affects her in ways not easy to trace and yet somehow revealing themselves in moods and attitudes and disharmonies that are so characteristic of the "new woman". This is mere speculation and may be wholly untrue. It is worth pondering. Being mentally averse to child-bearing (her mode of sexual self-expression since the dawn of life) and sexually unaccustomed to being so, modern woman, frightened by fecundity and nervously on guard against pregnancy, may be finding it increasingly difficult whole-heartedly to surrender herself sexually because she is ruled in her behavior by the subconsciously inhibiting and paralyzing force of fear of consequences. If we add the complicating influence of contraceptives: the harsh contradiction between esthetics and mechanics, between spontaneous impulse and deliberate planning, between natural love and artificial technic in loving!, we catch a brighter glimpse of the true state of affairs.

Then these significant considerations. Consciousness is a powerful brake on impulse. The modern woman is conscious of ideas, ambitions, hopes, outlooks on life that absorb a vast portion of her dynamic energy, tend-

ing in the process, inevitably, to subordinate body to coercive control. The ideal in contemporary civilization alike for woman and man is efficiency, which means in practice the gradual extirpation of all beautiful art, especially the vital arts of life and love, so costly in emotional expenditure, so leisurely and contemplative, so inherently hostile to the gospel of swift efficiency and clever common sense. Women are undergoing the same discipline of mechanization, the same dehumanization, the same emotional sterilization which men have been experiencing as part and parcel of their forced allegiance to the religion of efficiency. Women are divided against themselves. Caught between Sex and Society, oscillating between love and ambition, emulating man in the hectic and aggressive pursuit of power, modern woman finds her deep delight (true or false) in the cultivation and expansion of the Ego, not in the surrender of her personality i.e. her person, her Ego, to love. Hence it comes about that modern woman wants love but by ways implicit and explicit devotes herself to repudiating, or at least, minimizing its burdens and responsibilities and accomplishments, that she may pursue the more assiduously the ego-needs of her nature, newly awakened.

Nor is it permissible to omit such highly relevant factors as the latter-day cult of extra-marital pleasure-seeking; the satisfactory, if not utterly satisfying, pursuit of erotic stimulation in literature, in the theater, in miscellaneous admirations, in delightful coquetry, in brief, in playing with fire in and out of marriage,—electrifying substitutes for the experience, too often prosaic and feebly thrilling, of sexual intercourse. Even if it be true that she can positively and whole-heartedly enjoy sexual intercourse with her lover, can she experience a similar

delight with her husband? The modern woman's *psychology* is tainted with duality. Her mind champions equality and egotism. Her body (her ancient primitive instincts not yet quelled by Reason, the Arch-Rebel) cries out for overlordship and self-surrender. Sexually she is at odds with herself, her arrogant mind constantly at war with her humble body. Her love is disloyal to life and her life disloyal to love. . . .

We may speculate upon the potency in woman of that biologic rhythm of desire which the female of the species throughout the animal kingdom is endowed with and responds to automatically. Perhaps something akin to this law of sexual periodicity underlies (the uncorrupted) woman nature. If she had not been cajoled by male cunning into yielding her sex whenever her mate desired it, woman might have evolved a rhythm of desire conformable to a law of periodicity, interlinked in essence with the menstrual cycle.

But since Nature has so assigned the sexual functions that procreation fell to woman's lot and to man's recreation (let us not forget that woman could conceive without any accompaniment of pleasurable sexual sensation while to man the sex act was intoxicatingly pleasurable: —his reward for playing the male and making the female fertile!), what wonder that man, instinct-bound, sexually effervescent, converted her center of gravity into his center of levity! So to-day woman is caught between two opposing impulses: the procreational and the recreational. Having effectually canceled the impulse to procreation, she has not yet undergone the complete transformation of her emotional nature in the direction of the impulse to recreation. Sexually, therefore, she is assisting man to amplify and intensify sexual pleasure by

the frank and free-hearted substitution of the civilized rhythm of sex desire, "artificially" capable of stimulation in a hundred sensuous-subtle ways, for the now antiquated biologic rhythm of mating desire. Perhaps the key to the coital disharmony so prevalent in the love life of the sexes in marriage lies in the fact that the woman nature, so long devoted and habituated to marriage as procreation, with its biologic rhythm conformable to the nature of the reproductive instinct, has not yet had sufficient time and experience in the practice of sex love (in lieu of marital love!), *of marriage as recreation,* with its erotic rhythm conformable to the nature of the egocentric instinct. Woman is swiftly learning how to enjoy sexual intercourse as man's *playmate* and together they are learning to cultivate the Art of Love.

In fine, marital love has become intensely sexualized, consequent upon the repudiation of reproduction as the primary purpose of mating, and sexual love is becoming intensely genitalized, consequent upon the celebration of the joy of living as the true aim of married lovers. Love is now conceived as the profoundest of the arts, the great art of self-expression. But a host of women are not yet liberated from the deep-indwelling restraints woven about sex in marriage under the reproductive regimen. The sexual dissonance in modern marriage witnesses, in part, to the disharmony in the woman nature: half-hearted loyalty to the simple erotic art consonant with *marital* love; half-hearted loyalty to the subtle erotic art consonant with *sexual* love. In other words, the sexual awakening of woman in *marriage* is still in vivid process of becoming.

Perhaps it is fair to say that if woman fails in marriage her failure is sexual, and if man fails in marriage,

his failure is human. Woman does not know how to make marriage sexually worth while. Man does not know how to make marriage humanly worth while. Man and woman both fail to make life worth while. Because she fails sexually, man indulges in the evilly compensating experiences of prostitution (do women really *understand* the origin, expansion and vital relevancy of the prostitute phase of man's sex life?); adultery; divorce; separation (psychic more often than physical!); sexual duplicity; erotic tomfoolery, ranging from the comparatively innocent, though humiliating practice of masturbation to the mind-consuming habit of sexual reverie, sensually an over-compensation for love experienced in imagination but unrealized in experience. Man's troubled sex life is hardly a tribute either to woman's goodness or to her wisdom. Does woman feel genuinely responsible, in some intimate sense, for the sex life of man?

Nature, aided and abetted by personal vanity (and the will-to-power?), has saddled woman with an overriding purpose, none other than the subtle and persistent and, when necessary, the flagrant undermining of man's self-control. She occupies the paradoxical position of striving with a truly unremitting desire to prevent man from maintaining his self-control and then,—when her man has been plucked from the fires of destruction and been safely tucked away in the virtuous bed of marriage,—with an equally herculean energy of desire striving to prevent him from losing his self-control (by uncritical assumption, somehow supposed to be automatically achieved in marriage!). He must not be "tempted" by those multitudinous contriving females whose primary pursuit still must be the will-to-sexual-fulfillment with

its concomitant (moral) task of subtly undermining the self-control of all available males who pass in the seductive Night.

Thus woman has always occupied the tantalizing position—a baffling and befuddling moral duality—of secretly loving the Courtesan and openly worshipping the Madonna. From the sexually-scented, silken-sensuous undergarments that adorn her voluptuously sweet body to the male knickers that silhouette her form so enticingly (fulfilling in a novel manner her profound impulse to exhibitionism), woman wages incessant warfare against man's self-control, deftly and, when need be, mercilessly employing the weapons of her insidious loveliness to undermine him.

As a distinguished Analyst writes: "Even the most modest of girls, the one who otherwise avoids the least intimate contact with a man, once her inhibitions are canceled, as in mental disease, endeavors to entice the male by the exposure and the display of her charms." List to these enlightening words from the pen of a deep-minded woman, Dr. Grete Meisel-Hess: "Dread of the witchery of love is especially characteristic of the male. Man has always been afraid of woman as the temptress, the sorceress, embodying the forces of destruction. He trembles before her for the very reason that she allures. Millions of women have been the prey of adventurers, liars, cheats, and seducers; and yet woman has never dreaded man generically as the tempter, the destroyer. It is her mystical mission, it would seem, not to fear man, but to deliver herself up to him for life or for death. Whatever the consequences, she must and will be sexually mated. But man trembles, hesitates, takes to flight, when faced by his own desires."

If it is true that woman is relentlessly devoted to undermining man's sexual self-control, if she can't help wanting to make him burn with desire, if she feels triumphant when she has teased his manhood into self-consciousness, i.e. awareness of her sexual existence, is it not also part of woman's burden of responsibility to study male sexuality in its dynamic relation to stir and desire and to be concerned, more or less conscience-anxiously, about the profoundly human male problem of appeasement, lest frustrated stimulation lead to evil and sexual shame?

Man's failure in marriage is not so markedly sexual as human. In man's quivering limbs the fire of life burns luminous and strong. His sexual potency is remarkable, —if anything, in excess of human nature's civilized demands. His love of women is a religion. His faith in sex and life is incorrigibly naïve, the very groundwork of his personal existence. His erotic delight in life immensely exuberant, youthful, stimulating, deep-dwelling. Sexually, man is still a wonderfully potent savage, proud of his virility, infatuated with sensuality, a fruitful progenitor, a restless and inordinately passionate mate, a sex-intoxicated male. Woman is Sex, yet it is Man who is preëminently Sexual! But his *human nature* tends to destroy marriage. His pre-marital egotism carries over haughtily into married life and the results are nearly all bad. For though marriage cannot (and should not) attempt the visionary task of subjugating and nullifying egotism, it is important *to realize* that the intimately interdependent relation known as marriage cannot survive in experiences of gladness and of beauty unless humility (the genuine transfiguration of egotism by love) dwells in the lovers' hearts. Wedded life calls

for humility, yet as we all know, man has lived almost ruthlessly as egotist before marriage. Egotism, more than any other single cause, destroys the imagined sweetness and worthwhileness of marriage. Man is the arch-egotist.

Of course, from a woman's viewpoint, it may well be the other way round. The man is inept and botched sexually, the woman, well,—somewhat imperfect humanly. The human nature of woman is still so vastly gossipy and provincial. Her mind is imitative, trivial, shallow. Her nature inclined to practicality and shrewd common sense. Her emotions are self-willed and unenlightened. She lacks a sense of humor and therefore a sense of proportion. What she lacks in egotism she more than compensates for in vanity. As ambition is the meaning of man's life, so vanity is the meaning of woman's life. Her human nature is urgently hostile to the life of reason. Even in her chosen sphere of passion, her behavior witnesses to a dwarfed and destructive conception of life. And her capacity for self-indulgence knows no bounds. Intellectually a child, emotionally a savage, spiritually a dupe, esthetically a primitive, humanly a plaything of life rather than a creator of values, woman represents at its profoundest the dark failure of existence. If such an indictment were drawn, its only conspicuous untruth would lie in the implication that man is exempt from its withering application. But, it is perhaps wisest to assume that the truths about human nature are equally revelatory of the soul of man and of woman. So at least it is soothing to believe. Perhaps what men and women say of one another is most true of themselves. Clarity begins at home!

Man's human nature is so egotistic, impatient, argu-

mentative, brutally intellectual, malicious, querulous-critical, domineering, irritable, earth-bound, arrogant, disingenuous, unpoetical, spiritually coarse, what wonder marriage has become the institution it is, a hothouse where the rankest weeds grow, a sheltered place for the practice of the typically male disciplines of ignorance and arrogance? To be sure, woman, under latter-day egalitarian inspiration, is fast catching up with man and triumphantly developing a nice large ego of her own so that the judicious (who grieve not neither do they judge) have the unique pleasure of witnessing in ultra-modern marriages the union of two egotists, so morbidly sane, so terrifically self-centered and individualized, so uncontrollably self-conscious and introverted, withal so restless and unappeased, each so desperately eager for the other's complete surrender yet neither capable of self-sacrifice, we know we are in the presence of a pathologic passion-phenomenon, typically modern, of two suffocated egotists tortured by doubt and division, in love with perfection but wholly incapable of perfecting love, crack-brained mates crucified on the Calvary of self-love! Modern marriage is a study in auto-eroticism.

Oscillating fitfully between the Scylla of female ineptness, sexually, and the Charybdis of male arrogance, humanly, love-in-marriage ekes out a tortured existence in our neurotic age. Sexual discord everywhere. Ours is the Age of Perversion and Pathology. . . .

Let us return to a consideration of the problem briefly alluded to before, the reconciling power resident in sexual intercourse, adequately consummated. We speak glibly of sexual intercourse little realizing the far outspanned vital implications of that most unique of all human experiences. Perhaps the greatest solace sexual intercourse

brings is the sheer solace of forgetting: the jangling problematical universe is utterly forgotten, the troubled mind is momentarily laid to rest, consciousness flows smoothly, under a sort of hypnotic spell, the distraught and weary ego is becalmed and beguiled, permissibly auto-erotic, all the maddening duality of existence is for the blessed nonce blotted out, in the intense and perfectly concentrated *act* of sexual intercourse. A play within a play. *Illusion coalescing, as in a trance, with Reality.* Divine amnesia. Do married lovers sufficiently realize the golden key to harmony and to happiness they possess in the gift they may bestow upon one another in passionate sex union? The radiant warmth of bodies sexually stirred, the dramatic delight in the performance of a most unique act, a wonderful passion play, the lyrical exhilaration of the mind in erotic trance, the intense interlacing of passion and compassion, of self-love and sexual love, the joy of tasting life at its sparkling primal source, the mad satisfaction of sheet genital contact, the high mood of privileged indulgence, of being intimately a sharer in the sweetest of mysteries, the winged flight beyond the too oppressive earth, the exaltation of sexual release, then healing repose and the triumph of forgetting. What a miracle!

We cannot doubt it. If married lovers were great practitioners of love, if their technic were varied and passionwise, and their devotion to sexual felicity creatively alive and wholehearted, they could nourish one another's beings with satisfactions and fulfillments and rare delights the like of which no other human relation can bestow. What, in truth, is the meaning of marriage, poetically and spiritually, if it be not sexual felicity?

"Gentle and gracious mutual self-surrender in joyful

mood, and a happy down-sitting together to the feast of love which only man and woman can provide each for the other—such will be the new art of love." So speaks the persuasive Grete Meisel-Hess.

# PART TWO

# HUMAN NATURE IN THE MAKING

## Chapter VII

# THE SCIENCE OF RE-EDUCATION

No more significant tendency in the human sciences can well be imagined than the interpenetration of medicine and psychology. Psychological medicine, sometimes called the new psychology, symbolizes this fruitful coalescence.

The astonishingly *new* element in the new medicine and the new psychology is the fact that medicine has become essentially a study in education, or more accurately, in reëducation,—as Alfred Adler has clearly indicated. Pedagogy achieves a new importance. The teacher becomes for the first time, in reality as well as in rhetorical pretense, the most significant functionary in society. *The teacher's reëducation is of course an indispensable prerequisite to the reëducation of the child.*

What ailed the older, academic psychology? Simply this: it was beautifully sterile! Its beauty resided in technic and instrumental precision, in a pseudo-mathematical loveliness of formula that appealed deeply to shut-in minds that knew nothing of raw reality, of the complexity and variety of human nature, in short, of life as it is, realistically.

Its sterility (highly and positively correlated with its precision!) sprang from the fact that its subject-matter was not vitally important to human beings *qua* human. The organism—a living reality—was rather ignored. *Life*

was not the laboratory of these experts in minutiæ, these precision-haunted academicals. Far from it! Laboratory psychology was immersed in *puzzles* which it mistakenly thought of as *problems*. Academic psychology has been so artificial, sterile, non-human, largely because of its metaphysical interest in puzzles.

Problems cannot (and do not) seriously enter psychology until the *Clinic* rivals the academic laboratory in importance. The clinic is the center "par excellence" where raw reality, human nature, the living organism in its totality, life, as we experience it realistically, are the fundamental data of concern to the investigator. Only a realistic, i.e., a humanistic subject-matter can convert psychology into a fruitful discipline.

In other words, psychology in arriving at maturity becomes psychiatrized. Inevitably so, fortunately so.

This view of mine is elaborated in an essay entitled, "Mental Hygiene: The Quintessence of Dynamic Psychology," in Adler's "Zeitschrift für Individual-Psychologie". The Introductory Note to this essay reads:

"This chapter on Mental Hygiene in relation to Dynamic Psychology is, in sketchy outline, an attempt to do for academic psychology what Doctor Alfred Adler has done for clinical psychology, viz., to *interrelate human nature and social milieu* in the exposition of the phenomena of behavior.

"The distinguished philosopher, and educator, John Dewey, and the profound social scientist, Thorstein Veblen, have both emphasized, *as the basis of fruitful thinking,* this vital interrelation between human nature and the realistic social setting.

"The analysis which follows is an attempt definitely to introduce into psychology the realistic concept of *social forces* as indispensable elements in the study of behavior and experience."

Psychology at the service of life is the only kind of psychology worthy of our serious attention as humans urgently in need of a realistic insight into the dynamics of behavior (and misbehavior).

Hence, the overwhelming importance of the mental hygiene movement, psychoanalysis, individual psychology, behaviorism, child study: of all the varieties of dynamic psychology. The emergence of what I have termed *Educational Psychiatry* [1] which promises to become, in the next few decades, the most significant of all the human sciences, is the rich fruition of these dynamic trends in thinking.

Educational Psychiatry is the science of human nature in relation to its *potentialities for reëducation.* You may call it Dynamic Behaviorism, if you choose; dynamic because it embraces the twin realities of *experience* and behavior, thus differentiating it sharply from that static behaviorism which is concerned merely with the tangible mechanics of behavior as registered by an observer without the self-analytic report of the experiencer.

Educational Psychiatry, on its practical side, is interested in 'problem' children and 'problem' adults with a view to ameliorating their maladjusted relations to themselves and to society (humanistically conceived). We might express it by saying that the central problem of this new science is the study of *personality-deficit.* This concept expresses most penetratingly the kind of problem we are interested in. The teacher and the parent and the psychologist,—these three in particular,—are invited to undergo reëducation that they may become "educational psychiatrists" to the younger generation.

[1] Vide: "The New Educational Psychiatry" in *Psyche* (1927) in which this term is contributed for the first time to modern psychology.

Without in the least minimizing the great value of the contributions to the science of reëducation of Freud and Jung, I think it reasonable to assert that the most influential pioneer in educational psychiatry, i.e., in the direct application to school children and school teachers of the insights and technics of the "new psychology", has been Dr. Alfred Adler.

The reëducation of the sexes is the ultimate inspiring hope of an increasing number of men and women who, perceiving the recurrent futility, irrationality, and tragedy of human nature, are yet dedicated to the idea that human beings can be saved to beauty and high utility by a courageous transformation of the social system toward non-acquisitive goals, and of human nature toward creative activity.

## Chapter VIII

# MENTAL HYGIENE: THE QUINTESSENCE OF THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY

The evil origin of psychology in metaphysical habits of mind (at a time when philosophy was pursuing strange phantoms in ontological blind alleys) prepared the pattern for a vast amount of brilliant sterility in the pioneer phase of psychology.[1] A sterile abstractionism had reduced philosophy to a game of intellectual ping-pong, as delightful to the metaphysician as it was meaningless to man. *Static* conceptions of mind and of knowledge were the stock inspiration of these futilitarians. Inevitably so. The philosophers, typically shut-in personalities, extremely introverted, conceived thought as self-enclosed, a hothouse product of solicitous and subtle introspection. The *human* aspect of mind, to wit, the social situation, or, from another angle, the interrelation of minds in a realistic milieu, was simply ignored as irrelevant. Psychology, suckled at such anaemic breasts, could hardly grow up virile and tough-minded. Metaphysics was in a schizoid state and more than mildly pathological. As Professor Holt remarks, "Descartes o'er-hastily surveyed the human cortex with metaphysical line and compass and charted it with his all-but indelible dualistic ink." This muddle-headed dualism seeped into pioneer psychology and undermined its brilliant superstructures most insidiously.

[1] Cf. The learned judgments of William James and Stanley Hall.

We might refer to this period as, Meta-psychology, borrowing a term recently employed in a quixotic work by Freud. The all-consuming problem of pioneer psychology was the (insoluble) mind-body relation. Mathematics and mystic metaphysics, putting their erudite heads together, essayed most ingeniously to know the unknowable, to translate the nature of the cosmos into psychophysical terms. Shades of Fechner!

Psychological psychology, beginning with Wundt, took over the ideal of instrumental precision, but despite its wider range of problems, as in Wundt's consideration of language, art, myth, society, remained pent-up within the four walls of the laboratory where only static concepts of mind and artificial approaches to human behavior—a little reminiscent in theoretical purity of Condillac's 'statue' psychologizing [2]—could find a congenial habitat. It must be borne in mind that Wundt had sounded a warning as to the danger of overestimating the value of experiment, as did Münsterberg, James, Bergson, Hall, Rivers, McDougall, all in their turn, after him.

Though Wundt—or perhaps, more accurately, Lotze—introduced us definitely to a psychological-minded outlook on reality that accepted experience as the fundamental datum, this pioneer phase of dynamic psychology is characterized by methods and technics that still subordinated organism to organs, psychological observations to physiological categories, human nature in its variety to laboratory abstraction and over-simplification. Though Titchener speaks of psychology as the illumina-

[2] "It is on record that at the end of his life Condillac said he had neglected too much the idea of personality, the true subject of the whole analysis." Quoted in Brett, vol. ii, p. 294.

tion of life, not the most generous imagination can discover in his massive volumes of erudition (scholastic to the finger-tips) that quality of insight which accompanies an illumination of *life:* of human nature in its variety and dynamic complexity. What we were given was dynamic presupposition, static procedure. The result: a reversion to the metaphysics of mind.

When the inevitable disillusion set in, the psychologists jettisoned their metaphysical preconceptions and proceeded, apparently unencumbered, to sail in the smooth waters of genuine psychology, to wit, physiological psychology (as it was quaintly named). The pivotal problem was shifted from the ultimate nature of mind as embodied, for example, in the mystic mathematics of Fechner, to the immediate nature of mind revealing itself in the reactions of sense organs, as exemplified in the classic experiments of Helmholtz and of Weber. Here we confront the modern scientific attitude toward psychological subject-matter. We might, not unreasonably, call this period, meta-physiology.

If we should describe the first period as philosophical psychology and the second as physiological psychology, we might appropriately designate the third period in the evolution of our discipline as, *psychological* psychology, i.e., psychology studying concrete personality as a whole rather than sense organs (fragments of personality) or sheer abstractions.

Physiological psychology elevated the Laboratory to a position of dignity and importance comparable to the status of the laboratory in 'pure' sciences like physics and chemistry. Instruments of precision, achieving progressively a more adequate applicability to the problems at hand, became the all-absorbing goal of the truly scien-

tific psychologists. "Brass-instrument" psychologizing triumphed enormously. But, somehow, (there's the rub!) the splendid accumulation of subtle bits of information concerning organs did not eventuate in any profound knowledge of organism. It became abundantly evident that perfection of technic was not enough to make psychology a vital science. Precision having been attained, the problem remained of how to achieve *vitality,* for, lacking vitality of subject-matter, a cultural discipline is doomed to sterility, peters out in futility. Could the Laboratory be conjoined with Life? That was the question (though not framed in these dramatic terms) that faced an abstract and detached and precision-haunted psychology two decades ago. Psychology, tainted at its birth by a consumptive heredity, was dying of pernicious anemia! Brilliant technic, obtuse subject-matter. The worship of laboratory technic had resulted in an almost complete neglect of the all-too-human relation between psychology and life.

As the brilliant Rivers pointed out in his very enlightening book on "Psychology And Politics", "The social psychologist is here confronted with a problem very similar to that which was presented thirty years ago to the individual psychologist when he was first introduced to the experimental method. Carried away by the glamour and attractiveness of a new method, many believed that the problems of psychology were going to be solved by experimental methods. Advocates of what in those days was called the 'new psychology' firmly believed that the more they refined their methods and measured by the thousandth of a second, and the more they multiplied the observations so made, and applied to them the most elaborate statistical methods, the sooner

they would reach the psychological millennium. The hopes thus raised have been rudely disappointed, though believers still linger here and there. The disillusionment came because the advocates of these new methods did not appreciate the fact that *we need knowledge derived from the close qualitative study of the individual mind,*[3] and from the comparison of its nature under such variation of conditions as disease provides, before we can expect to be able to utilize such statistical data as are provided by the very limited forms of mental activity to which the experimental method is capable of application."

Nor is it far-fetched to perceive in behaviorism not merely a dynamic protest against the metaphysics of introspectionalism, but also a forced reversion to the period of mechanistic physiology, because behaviorism, too, is caught in the contradiction of trying to 'solve' the problems of human behavior, of personality, of life, by means of an antiquated, static, enormously oversimplified technic. As the Gestalt psychologists, and also the psychoanalysts, repeatedly demonstrate.

*Historically the dilemma of psychology consists in the application of static procedure to dynamic subject-matter.*

Psychology had begun with two remarkable misconceptions: one, of subject-matter and two, of method. As subject-matter the soul was quite sterile, as method, metaphysical guesswork was equally so. Physiological psychology, laboring under this blundering tradition, tried to correct both errors of subject-matter and of method by substituting for the one a tangible brain, and for the other a verifiable technic. Unfortunately, the

[3] My italics.

task of creating a real science of psychology proved far from simple. A tangible brain revealed itself as indissolubly linked to an intangible mind; a verifiable technic failed to get itself verified at many vital points. Speculation continued somehow to be the handmaiden of science. Apparently, unavoidably so. Psychological psychology, caught in this desperate impasse, has sought to escape from its predicament by enlarging the content of its subject-matter to include the social and psychiatric and anthropological factors in behavior and experience, and by re-defining its method so as to supplement laboratory technic with statistical, clinical, psychoanalytic, and biographical modes of approach to psychological phenomena.[4] It is only fair to assign to psychoanalysis the major credit for the discovery of a theory of experience that involves the co-functioning of a dynamic subject-matter with an equally dynamic methodology.

Clinical psychology (at its best) symbolizes the coordination of science and life. Precision *and vitality* are for the first time in the history of psychology adequately harmonized, profoundly equated. Every technic that psychology has invented in its historic quest for precision is now at the disposal of a realistic subject-matter and becomes, in its turn, vitalized, humanized, fructified by contact with genuine situations, in fine, with life.

Is it unreasonable to believe that the period of *puzzle* psychology is nearing its end, while the period of *problem* psychology is only at its promising beginning? Puzzle psychology is inevitable so long as you divorce mind from its social setting, from what I like to call, its realistic

[4] It is interesting to note that the concept of biography has also found its way into the new physics. *Vide:* "Analysis of Mind," by Bertrand Russell.

milieu. In such an event, the whole emphasis in research falls upon ingenuity (to the neglect of insight) and upon ingenuity's pursuit of precision to the last degree of refinement of technic.[5] A self-defeating procedure, for, in psychology above all other sciences, life (i.e., the vital interrelation of personality and social situation) is the fundamental datum. Once you perceive the self-deluding nature of puzzle-psychology with its over-emphasis on ingenuity, and turn your attention to the realistic milieu with its challenging situations, you are face to face with a problem-psychology with its characteristic subordination of ingenuity to insight.

Think of Fechner and then of Freud, to catch the point of what I mean. Fechner, inventing mathematical technics for the solution of metaphysical puzzles, master of ingenuity, of whom James could write: "Fechner's book was the starting-point of a new department of literature, which it would be perhaps impossible to match for the qualities of thoroughness and subtlety, but of which, in the humble opinion of the present writer, the proper psychological outcome is just *nothing*." [6] This drastic opinion of one of the most important chapters in traditional psychology was later reasserted by that equally philosophical (and too little scientific?) psychologist, G. Stanley Hall, the enthusiast for novelties.

Think of Freud (for all his grotesquerie), discovering psychological mechanisms for the clarification of vitally human problems, master of insight, of whom McDougall recently wrote: "I believe that Prof. Freud has done

[5] "In spite of his trenchant criticisms, we feel that Condillac had less insight into the complexity of mental life than Locke: psychology, in pursuing the analysis of the understanding, seems to have lost touch with the fulness of life." Quoted in Brett, vol. ii, pp. 293, 294.

[6] James, "Principles," Vol. I, p. 534.

more for the advancement of psychology than any student since Aristotle." [7]

It is worth while noting an interesting dilemma that arose. Medicine which had devoted itself almost exclusively to the physiological aspect of behavior found itself in an impasse, especially in neurology, and made a bold leap into psychological speculation, as a tactic of salvation; while psychology, confronted with the bewilderment of mentalistic hypotheses and interpretations, sought as its salvation a refuge in physiology. Medicine, quintessentially physiologic, turned audaciously psychologic; and psychology, by explicit definition emphatically mentalistic, surrendering to physiology! A strange situation.

The revolution in medicine (called by some, Psychological Medicine and by others, The New Psychology!) consisted, briefly, in this momentous realization: human science, to be fruitful, to be vital, must pay attention, not primarily to organs but to organism; not primarily to symptoms but to personality. A profound discovery, this, which is gradually penetrating the field of psychology, in truth, of the human sciences in general.[8]

In short, *life* became the laboratory of the psychologists. The emergence of the Scholastic Tests (the so-called Intelligence Tests); the rapid development of statistical technic to meet the educational need of group tests and mass determinations of ability; the mushroom-like growth of 'applied' psychology; the post-war dis-

[7] McDougall, "Outline of Abnormal Psychology," Preface viii.

[8] As witness the latter-day assumptions of Whitehead, Haldane, Dewey, McDougall, Kantor, Tolman, Thurstone, Eldridge, Herrick, Jennings, Kempf, Barnes; not to omit an influential school of psychiatrists and psychoanalysts. The "organismic" hypothesis holds the center of the stage in contemporary thought. The "Gestalt" psychology is similarly grounded.

illusionment that sought to come to terms with unpalatable reality 'via' the consolations of psychological counselors (of a psychoanalytic trend of thought); the rather sudden realization that psychology, in the service of life, may well be the most illuminating gateway to knowledge and wisdom; finally, the obsessive popular interest in psychoanalysis, child psychology, and most recently, in behaviorism;—these potent forces all conspired to deepen the content of psychology, to *humanize* it.

Psychology, in arriving at maturity, becomes the lawfully wedded spouse of psychiatry. A most fruitful marriage, if not a very happy one.

Thus we come to the heart of the matter: Dynamic psychology triumphs on all fronts.[9] *Scientific method at the disposal of clinical subject-matter* promises to elevate psychology to the predominant position among the human sciences. The dream of the great ones in psychology, from Aristotle's dawning day to ours, viz., that psychology is the key that unlocks the secrets and intricacies of human nature, is on the shining threshold of realization. We are now beginning to understand that only as it studies personality does psychology become really psychological-minded. As Franz says: "Psychology borders upon psychiatry and neurology, and is closely associated with psychopathology."

Mental Hygiene occupies the most felicitous position of all. As the lucky heir of all the social and psychological sciences, its heritage is as rich and excellent as its inheritance. Whatever is significant in medicine, sociology, biology, laboratory psychology, ethics, criminology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, behaviorism, psychopathol-

[9] Note the varied dynamic conceptions of Woodworth, F. L. Wells, Moore, Kempf, MacCurdy.

ogy, education, *and life,* has nurtured the childhood of Mental Hygiene. As I see it, the quintessence of dynamic psychology *is* mental hygiene.

The traditional demarcation between normal and abnormal becomes erased since the behavior stigmatized as abnormal is but the outgrowth and dramatic exaggeration of the behavior conventionally honored as normal. The familiar antithesis between sane and insane loses its *raison d'être,* for as Maudsley wrote: "Insanities are not really so different from sanities that they need a new and special language to describe them, nor are they so separated from other nervous disorders by lines of demarcation as to render it wise to distinguish every feature of them by a special technical nomenclature. The effect of such a procedure can hardly fail to be to make artificial distinctions where divisions exist not in nature, and thus to set up barriers to true observation and inference."

As Dr. Harrington reminds us: "But no matter what system of classification we may adopt, we need never expect to find any definite lines of cleavage dividing our cases into distinct groups, any more than we need expect to find a definite line of demarcation separating the abnormal from the normal." Pathology terrifies no longer. Interestingly enough, the statistical conception of the 'normal curve of distribution' worked out by academic, i.e., normal psychology has been taken over by clinical, i.e., abnormal psychology. An illuminating Editorial in the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* (Jan. 1926) reads as follows: "Whereas formerly a lunatic was considered as a separate being, wholly apart from all the regular members of society, now we are recognizing more and more graded amounts of mental disorder, in which the normal passes in a constant series over into the ab-

normal. We have been educated to the fact that by no means all of the lunatics are in the insane asylums, and the new conception of mental disorder as something statistical is reflected clearly in the latest trends in mental hygiene, a national movement that regards public mental health as something in which there are no sharp lines of cleavage, but all the shades of grey, from deep black to bright white. . . . The demand of the psychoanalyst that his patient shall face reality is beginning to apply with special emphasis to the subject of psychology itself. For the most real problem of psychology is becoming that of pointing the way by which an individual may better his behavior."

Mental hygiene (dynamic psychology in action) has the absorbing task of confronting and clarifying those contradictory and perturbing aspects of human nature which go by the antithetical names of rational-irrational, conscious-subconscious, intellectual-instinctive, integrated-disintegrated, sane-insane, normal-abnormal, conventional-unconventional, law-abiding-delinquent, intelligent-stupid, sagacious-witless. Human nature in a realistic milieu! And, fortunately, as a growing number of competent minds are asserting, these typically psychological problems can best be 'solved' by the *coöperation* of educators, social workers, psychologists, physicians. In the words of a distinguished English psychiatrist, "The inquiry (into mental disorder) is a fascinating one, and the problem can be more quickly unraveled by the working of physician, psychologist, and educationalist in close collaboration." [10]

[10] Sir Maurice Craig, M.D., "Some Aspects of Education and Training in Relation to Mental Disorder," in the *Journal of Mental Hygiene,* 1923, p. 226.

An obligation rests upon educator and psychologist (the psychiatrist is enthusiastically on the job) which must sooner or later be met. That obligation can only be fulfilled by a systematic and sympathetic study of students as personalities. The program stretches from the kindergarten to the university. Nothing could be more important for the vitalizing of education and of psychology than these psycho-biographical analyses,—these studies in 'individual psychology,' as Dr. Alfred Adler would call them. Mental hygiene combines what is technically valuable in experimental psychology with what is humanly significant in clinical psychopathology, and the result is the most thought-provoking series of contributions to the analysis and clarification of human nature *in crises of maladjustment* that contemporary psychology can show.

Here we trip on the crux of the matter. Problems of maladjustment are precisely the challenging situations of fundamental importance when civilization is at the crossroads, when thinking people are desperately hard put to it to discover technics and devices for ameliorating the contradictions, disharmonies, sexual discord, personal frustration, spreading disillusion, neurotic and psychotic handicaps that, like so many scars, disfigure the face of contemporary civilization.

A psychology that would call itself mature must study these inescapable problems of maladjustment. As Donald A. Laird says: "What are the colleges and universities doing to help their young people over such crises as these.[11] And, if one be frank, one must answer: Ab-

[11] "Case Studies in the Mental Problems of Later Adolescence with Special Reference to the Mental Hygiene of the College Student." In the *Journal of Mental Hygiene,* 1923, p. 732.

solutely nothing that really counts. . . . Without undue conceit, it may be honestly stated that in the case of most of the students reported in this article, the most valuable contribution that college has made to them so far has been their talk with the writer over things in general and themselves in particular. . . . Until then they had been the somewhat passive absorbers of information; then they were given the essentials of an education. . . . Difficult mental adaptations, usually with a bad solution of the intrinsic mental difficulty, are of very common occurrence among college students. There is nothing peculiar to students or to colleges about this. Its significance lies in the fact that the colleges offer a splendid opportunity for the study of mental adaptations, both for better and for worse."

Dr. Bernard Glueck expresses it even more penetratingly when he writes: "Mental disorder, difficulties of the personality, and aberrations of behavior came to be recognized more and more as merely the expressions of serious difficulties in adaptation to the requirements of life, the precise causes for which are to be sought not solely in the pathological laboratory, but also in the laboratory of life, in the home and the school and the broader social setting in which the individual works out his love life and his bread life." [12]

No one, competent to judge, will question the reasonableness of Laird's opinion that "College students are eager for instruction in mental hygiene, especially as it affects them personally. It was estimated to be of more value than any other part of the Course in elementary psychology. That it results in much personal benefit is

[12] "A Mental Hygiene of Childhood," in *Mental Hygiene,* 1924, p. 651.

shown by the results 'before and after taking', which will be reported in detail shortly." [13]

Dr. H. Crichton Miller, the brilliant English psychoanalyst, sums up the situation in these clever lines: "The first stage in education may be described as that in which the teacher was expected only to know Latin, if he was to be regarded as competent to teach John Latin. About half a century ago, the idea began to dawn—very gradually, of course—that it would be a good thing to know, not only Latin, but also John. And now we come to the third era—the most challenging of the three—when you are expected to know not only Latin and John, but also yourselves." [14]

On the high authority of Dr. William A. White, we are told that "many mental breakdowns, perhaps the majority of them, occur during adolescence or in early adulthood, and that systematic help extended to the youths in our schools and colleges would be of inestimable value in preventing such breakdowns."

If we survey the situation more specifically, we come upon conclusions of the first importance to psychologists who perceive the expanding need for making life itself the laboratory of future experimental studies. Dr. Phyllis Blanchard and Dr. Richard H. Paynter write a long summary of findings concerning "The Problem Child" among which these three are most relevant to our discussion:

Summary (in Part):

[13] "The Reaction of College Students to Mental Hygiene," in *Mental Hygiene,* 1923, p. 276.

[14] "Psychoanalysis and the School," in *Mental Hygiene,* 1923, pp. 34, 35.

19. School retardation is shown by individual case studies to be the result of other factors as well as intellectual dullness or mental defect.
22. The school needs social and psychiatric studies of its pupils as well as the medical and psychological examinations that are now in vogue.
24. Before entering school, all children should have the benefit of a thorough clinical examination, that incipient difficulties may be detected and later maladjustments prevented.[15]

Dr. Ira S. Wile, educator and psychiatrist, makes this pregnant observation: "Our present conception of individuality includes all the factors that enter into juvenile personality. The child is not an intellectual mechanism *per se*. His physical, emotional, and social life enters into, affects, and is conditioned by his intellectual life. All of the child goes to school—not merely his intellect." [16]

Dr. Frankwood E. Williams, in a stimulating survey of the collegiate situation, remarks incisively: "It is a shocking fact that technical skill and knowledge of behavior disorders are more generally applied in the study and rehabilitation of criminals than to disciplinary problems in colleges. Many men and women technically trained are daily applying their knowledge and skill in situations where the least can be expected; while, with two or three possible exceptions, no college or university in the country, so far as I am aware, is utilizing in any systematic way such knowledge in the handling of its disciplinary problems.

[15] "The Problem Child," in *Mental Hygiene*, 1924, p. 54.

[16] " 'Good' Education and 'Bad' Children," in *Mental Hygiene*, 1925, p. 109.

"There is not a student in the university, from the leading 'honors' man to the boy who is flunking, to whom matters of mental hygiene are not matters of vital concern. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that, as we begin to think of mental hygiene in relation to the college, we think of it in sufficiently broad terms to give it sufficiently broad scope. It would be a most serious mistake to narrow our conception of its function to that of searching for 'sick' students.

"The emphasis of the university at the present time is upon intellectualism. But an intellectualism that is but a handmaiden to other personal forces may be a malignant thing. Intellectualism is not enough . . . one agrees with the statement of President Hopkins, of Dartmouth, that 'we cannot safely develop intellectualism unless we preserve mental health at the same time.'" [17]

Dr. Martin W. Peck (whose coöperative study with F. L. Wells of the psychosexuality of college men is a work of pioneer character), summarizes his findings as follows: "Among other things, it will be desirable to supplement the intelligence tests now used extensively by psychologists with systematic examinations of other and no less important phases of the mental life.

"The method followed was to present a series of topics and induce the men to discuss them.

"An exceedingly intimate glimpse into the personality of another individual can be gained by an hour's conversation of this type, as contrasted with long acquaintanceship on ordinary terms.

"Conclusions:

[17] "Mental Hygiene and the College Student: Second Paper," in *Mental Hygiene,* 1925, pp. 245, 250, 260.

1. Routine mental examinations can be advantageously applied to college students as a supplement to other medical and psychological studies.
2. Examinations of this nature should contribute something worth while to nearly every man, and in conditions of faulty mental hygiene and the minor neuroses, there may be results of great value from both prophylactic and therapeutic standpoints.
3. The proportion of college students suffering from personality disorders and functional nervous illness is large.
4. These conditions appear to bear little relation to general physical health." [18]

Another article vitally relevant to our purpose is that of Dr. Smiley Blanton whose mental hygiene activities have led him to these conclusions: "The great work of mental hygiene lies in the prevention of failures and mental breakdowns through a specific type of education.[19]

"The mythical normal person does not exist. All people are possessed of primitive tendencies that must be directed and modified, and of conflicts that cause waste and failure. The very word 'normal' connotes an idea of abnormality that does not exist in fact and divides people into artificial classes of normal and abnormal.

"Every student, whether a failure or a success, would be benefited by an understanding of himself, and that

[18] "Mental Examinations of College Men," in *Mental Hygiene*, 1925, pp. 282, 283, 298, 299. (Cf. The findings of the writer's research on this point, particularly the West Point group.)

[19] Or, more pointedly, reëducation.

understanding should be given him as an integral part of his education.

"A study of more than one thousand unselected college students, juniors and seniors, has shown that fully half have emotional difficulties that will prevent them from realizing their highest possibilities, while fully 10 per cent have maladjustments serious enough to warp their lives and in some cases to cause mental breakdowns unless properly treated.

"Dean Johnston (of the University of Minnesota), recently said: 'The first two years of a student's life in college should be devoted to finding out about himself and his own problems. He should learn to understand himself so that he is a smooth-working machine, and not be filled with conflicts and inhibitions and go jerkily along like a poor machine out of gear.' " [20]

Of the keenest interest to the so-called academic psychologist (because it presages a novel departure in the management of matters psychiatrical) are the persuasive observations and judgments of Kimball Young, a few of which I shall quote at length here: "Yet, in spite of the services of the intelligence test, there still remains for us the increasingly urgent problem of assisting the student in his emotional and personality adjustments. For life success, the emotional core of personality is coming to be recognized as of equal if not greater importance than intelligence, since the most intelligent person is of little value to himself or to society if his emotional life is confused and dislocated.

"It might be imagined that academic departments of psychology should lend aid with the students' emotional

[20] "A Mental Hygiene Program for Colleges," in *Mental Hygiene*, 1925, pp. 478, 479, 481.

difficulties. It is true that they might do so, but with few exceptions they do not. A great many well-trained psychologists still lack any concrete clinical experience with problems of motivation and conduct disorder. Not infrequently, in fact, there is a general disbelief in the inclusion of student counsel as a part of the psychologist's work.

"It is evident enough, I take it, that the problem is one that college and university administration must face. If we are to salvage some of the students—often students of the highest abilities—who encounter personality disturbances in college and often never fully recapture normality, we must give attention not only to curricular needs and to the matter of intellectual aptitudes, we must above all else give time and energy to the problem of personality on the emotional and affective side." [21]

I find it difficult to imagine anything more promising in the contemporary scene than the 'rapprochement' between medicine and psychology, admirably embodied in the mental hygiene movement. There are few chapters in the history of thought more interesting or provocative than the one setting forth the interrelations of these two brilliant disciplines. Philosophic and psychologic medicine play their vital parts still in current theorizings. It may be worth our while to glance at the contributions made by the medically-oriented mind to the history and progress of psychology. What a band of distinguished figures in psychology's unfoldment who had pursued medical studies as part of their educational equipment! [22]

[21] "Mental Hygiene and Personality Guidance in Colleges," in *Mental Hygiene,* 1925, pp. 489, 491, 500.

[22] In compiling this summary I am following the excellent work of Prof. Brett, "A History of Psychology," vols. ii. and iii.

*Descartes* may be included in a parenthesis as having studied anatomy and made dissections for himself.

*Locke* properly heads the list as physician and philosopher. It was Locke who anticipated the modern trend in psychology and psychiatry with his dictum: "But an absolutely normal person is an ideal, scarcely ever realized; most people are not quite sound in body or mind, there is no one who has not some degree of madness." [23] It was Locke, also, who broadened the doctrine of association by his emphasis on "disorders of the mind as the basis of association of ideas."

*Hartley* is reputed the originator of physiological psychology.

Concerning the influence of medical viewpoints at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries, Professor Brett says: "Metzger called his subject 'Medizinisch-philosophische Anthropologie', and that array of terms shows significantly the points of view which at this time were coming to be regarded as the particular contents of psychology. The medical and the social interests acquired increasing force." [24]

*La Mettrie* was a "psychic anthropologist: he was seeking for an explanation of life in terms of both body and soul. . . . For here we find the most outspoken rejection of that doctrine which regarded man as wholly unique, a fallen angel, a corrupted image of God. . . . Nothing was more conspicuously absent when La Mettrie wrote than the idea of man as a creature whose life is conditioned by physical states. That idea was to grow and La Mettrie should have the honour of being one of the first to stimulate that growth." [25]

*Haller* was the first to emphasize the doctrine of irritability.

[23] In Brett, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 323.

[24] "I take it that no man is educated who has never dallied with the thought of suicide." Thus the exuberant William James.

[25] Brett, vol. ii, pp. 358, 359.

*Bichat* is reputed to have been the founder of modern anatomy.

*Pinel* proposed to treat insanity as a derangement of function (not as "possession") by the methods of pathology.

*Itard* (who was influenced by Pereira) made the classic experiment on the "savage of Aveyron,"—the "wild man," in reality a boy who had been found in the woods of Aveyron, a genuine child of nature,—by which he attempted to reconstruct the mind of that uncivilized boy. This experiment, though far from successful, was the beginning of the modern development of methods looking to the rehabilitation of defective mentality.

*Esquirol* (a follower of Pinel) was a pioneer in modern psychiatry.

*Mesmer* whose quixotic experimentation with "animal magnetism" laid the basis for a significant development in the field of hypnotic phenomena.

*Dubreuil* stressed psychic factors in disease.

"The interests of the naturalist and the doctor were fused with the interest shown by the Encyclopædists in man as a social and political animal; out of the turmoil emerged a new type of thought and literature concerned with the interrelation of mental and physical functions." [26]

*Cabanis* is reputed to have been the founder of modern physiological psychology. He was a significant educator, marvelously well read, and as a professor of medicine dealt with the nature of diseases from what was then a new point of view, and above all, insisted on the relations of mind and body in every stage and crisis of life. He had the psycho-physiological point of view, and had apparently been influenced by Dubreuil, Mesmer, Pinel. It was Cabanis' inspiration to treat the human being psychologically as well as physiologically.[27]

[26] *Op cit.*, p. 375.
[27] Brett, vol. ii, pp. 376, 377.

"Bichat, Pinel and Cabanis stand together as the three great exponents of philosophy and medicine during the last decade of the eighteenth century. . . . From Cabanis arose the various departmental studies by which the concept of psychology was to be continuously enlarged, including the study of abnormal psychology, of national or ethnological psychology, of genetic psychology, and of social psychology." [28]

*Hamilton* though primarily a brilliant metaphysician, had a considerable medical knowledge. The concept of redintegration which he developed has been ingeniously applied to the study of the mechanism involved in psychoneurotic reaction.[29]

*Gall* and *Spurzheim* were the originators of "cranioscopy," what is more popularly known as "phrenology." They attempted to distinguish and locate faculties numbering in all thirty-five. "Gall effectively overcame the lingering tendency to isolate man from nature."

*Flourens* stressed the unity of the cerebrum, emphasizing the possibility of vicarious action: "such that any function temporarily lost might reappear if sufficient time was allowed, as the acquired function of some other part of the brain." [30]

In general, in merely sketchy reference, we might allude to the vast influence of the medically-oriented mind upon the evolution of psychology, especially in the fields of anatomy, physiology, neurology, from the grossly unscientific but nevertheless quite important work of Gall and Spurzheim to the very recent studies of Casamajor and Tilney. 'Psychological medicine' aptly characterizes

[28] *Op. cit.*, pp. 377, 381.

[29] *Vide:* Hollingworth's "The Psychology of Functional Neuroses."

[30] Brett, vol. iii, p. 94. This view keenly anticipates the latter-day experimental researches, constituting almost a revolution in neurology and educational psychiatry, of Franz, Lashley, Head.

the nature of the bond between two historically interrelated disciplines.

*Purkinje* was the first, it appears, to use the term protoplasm. He was the discoverer of the ganglionic cells in the brain and those fibers which bear his name. His work on the subjective visual experiences which are caused by galvanic stimulation, and on the relation between brightness of color and intensity of light, the so-called "Purkinje phenomenon," is well known.

*Young,* the distinguished and erudite author of the wave theory of light, has been called the "father of physiological optics." The Young-Helmholtz theory of color-vision is still looked upon as one of the three great contributions to the problem of color-vision.

*Helmholtz* is that many-sided genius in science whose classic work on sensations of sight, sensations of sound, and the application of scientific method to the study of psycho-physiological phenomena is one of the famous chapters in the history of thought. "In time medicine, mathematics, and physics became for him the means by which the inner world of thought might objectify and realize itself." [31] The work of Helmholtz is generally looked upon as the real basis of experimental psychology.

*Johannes Müller* contributed the important doctrine of "specific energies."

*E. H. Weber* specialized in the physiology of touch and opened up a new chapter in that field of psychology. His theory of "sensation circles" and his experiments on the "two-point threshold" are still live problems among a group of experts in contemporary psychology.

*Du Bois-Reymond* made important studies of "animal magnetism."

"During the years from 1830 to 1860 they (Helmholtz, Müller, Weber, Reymond, Lotze) contributed epoch-

[31] Brett, vol. iii, pp. 117, 118.

making discoveries to such different sciences as physiology, physics, medicine, and psychology." [32]

*Fechner* captured the admiration of the psycho-physiologists by his mathematical demonstration of the Weber conception of the relation between stimulus and sensation. His "Elemente der Psychophysik" published in 1860 is a landmark in the history of psychological speculation. The so-called "Weber-Fechner Law" is a magnificent pillar of the temple of psycho-physics which still has a band of faithful pilgrims as its humble worshippers. The origin of Fechner's mystic conception of the mathematical nature of the cosmos is interesting: "Lying in bed on the morning of the twenty-second of October, 1850, he saw the vision of a unified world of thought, spirit, and matter linked together by the mystery of numbers." [33]

*Lotze* as an opponent of vitalism attempted to reconcile science and philosophy. The title of his chief work, "Die Medizinische Psychologie Oder Physiologie der Seele," is sufficiently indicative of the large influence of medicine upon psychologizing.

*Wundt* whose case is illuminating since his career "has been a gradual transit from the microscopic study of nerves, through the general field of physiological psychology and psychophysics, into the wider realms of social psychology and metaphysical speculation." . . . Wundt's "method of psychology" represented a complex system: from pure analysis to the study of language, myth, art, and religion. Wundt might reasonably be called the first full-fledged psychological psychologist.

*Muensterberg* might be said to symbolize the modern conflict in the mind of the psychologist whose attempt to be loyal to pure physiological technique on the one hand, and to the variety and complexity of human behavior (i.e., life's values, as Muensterberg termed them) on the other, lands him in the

[32] *Op. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 111.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. 128.

perplexity so lucidly exemplified in Muensterberg's double-headed psychology: for the sake of science, man is reduced to sheer automatism; for the sake of life's values, man is celebrated as possessing free will and creative power!

Psychology as an exact science received an "objective" emphasis on sensori-motor system as the basis of psychological science, while subjectivity and idealism and voluntarism were reserved for history. . . . The baleful antithesis between science and life which Muensterberg's psychology attempted in vain to solve is still the moot problem in contemporary thought.

For the sake of completeness in our attempt to trace the influence of the medically-oriented mind upon the development of psychology, we may briefly include the contributions of Kraepelin, Binet, Simon, Charcot, Janet, James, Ellis, Rivers, Sidis, Hall, Prince, Montessori, McDougall, Freud, Jung, Adler, Jones, Hart, Kempf, MacCurdy, Crile, Cannon, Head, Hurst, Franz, F. L. Wells, W. F. Dearborn, G. Van Ness Dearborn, Gesell, G. V. Hamilton, Moore, and a significant group of lesser persons all of whom have in their several ways helped to clarify the problems of human nature by envisaging man and his social milieu in terms of a psychology the vital core of which is psychiatry. Nor must we slight the value for psychological comprehension of various recent studies in Endocrinology.

The emergence of the Psycho-Clinic and of the Mental Hygiene Movement in education announces the coming-to-maturity of scientific psychology; psychology at the service of life.

Within the astonishingly brief period of less than fifteen years a most pervasive revolution (quite bloodless) has taken place in the world of the psychologists. The

center of gravity has shifted from the intellectual to the emotional factors in behavior and experience. Intelligence tests are no longer deemed intelligent unless accompanied by personality tests: tests of character, social intelligence, emotional stability, psycho-sexual behavior, in short, 'personal data' studies.

It is becoming a widely accepted truism that you can know nothing vitally important about an individual unless you are intimately acquainted with his (or her) *emotional make-up.* Social psychology, abnormal psychology, psychopathology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, behaviorism (on the human level), general dynamic psychology, mental hygiene most particularly, are all vastly preoccupied with aspects of personality and factors in behavior that are sub-rational, autonomic, emotional in nature.

Here are the sober words of Prof. Thurstone on the 'revolution' that has been progressing almost 'unconsciously' in our midst of late and styling itself with the exhilarating title of the new psychology (or more startling, still, psychological medicine): "The content of psychoanalysis, psychiatry, and of the so-called new psychology, is much more important than the content with which we have busied ourselves as scientific psychologists. The underlying relation between the life demands of the organism and the behavior by which these life demands are satisfied is the subject of psychoanalytic study, and that relation is more important as a determinant of mental life, personality and conduct, than the stimulus-response relation to which we as scientific psychologists have given most of our effort." [34]

In brief résumé: The emphasis of Charcot on the na-

[34] *Psychological Review,* 1924.

ture of hysteria;[35] the brilliant demonstration by Janet of the mechanism of dissociation; the strangely effective method of catharsis invented by Breuer; the analysis of the nature of suggestion by Sidis; the courageous discovery of infantile sexuality and its relation to the parental and familial situation, by Freud; Jung's stimulating ideas, including the use of the 'free' association method, the psychoanalytic emphasis on individual emancipation, and keenest of all, his theory of psychological types; Adler's profound contribution of the 'inferiority complex' and the mechanism of 'compensation';[36] the vast significance for latter-day enlightenment of the concept of rationalization, eagerly championed by Jones; the quite normal presentation of the psychology of insanity by Hart;—these clinically-conceived theories of human nature, *in its crises of maladjustment,* have shed a wonderful light upon the obscure motivations of man. This psychiatric invasion of the realm of psychology has wrought a wholesome havoc among the rather static presuppositions of 'normal' psychology, the valuable consequences of which may be observed in the new preoccupation with *dynamic* concepts and, more impressively, in the absorption of 'abnormal' subject-matter into 'normal' psychologizing. The clinic and the class room are learning to coöperate in behalf of a common aim, viz., a scientific study of personality. Psychology can no longer get along satisfactorily without the support of psychiatry: and to make the equation

[35] Which Jastrow refers to as the malady "par excellence" toward the control of which the technic called civilization must be directed.

[36] Dr. Adler recently told the writer that he had long ago rejected psychoanalysis in favor of what he terms "individual psychology," a method that is essentially pedagogic rather than medical in its conception and treatment of "problem cases," which we in America would call reëducation.

complete, it is equally important to point out that psychiatry can no longer get along satisfactorily without the support of psychology!

Perhaps that is what the re-oriented minds mean when they speak of psychological medicine, meaning 'the new psychology.'

In the synthetic movement called Mental Hygiene (which embraces all the human sciences), the contradictions that have cluttered up the evolution of psychology and of medicine, have been laid to rest by the sheer pragmatic and humanistic need of salvaging personality: —the true objective of science being the amelioration of the lot of man. The ancient dichotomies have faded into a well-merited obscurity. Our minds are no longer obsessed by the historic antitheses between man and beast, soul and body, reason and instinct, thought and feeling, reflection and sensation, spiritualism and materialism, free-will and mechanism, higher and lower (faculties), metaphysical and physical, normal and abnormal, sane and insane, psychology and physiology, conscious and unconscious, philosophy and science. Our relativistic minds,[37] more reasonable and flexible than the absolutistic minds of yore, are wisely subordinating, and wherever feasible, simply ignoring the crack-brained (i.e., schizoid) dilemmas of a self-enclosed psychology that ceaselessly whirled between the Scylla of metaphysics and the Charybdis of physics, forever in flight from reality, from life.

We escape from these historic futilities by focusing our attention upon man and his realistic milieu, and conceiv-

[37] *Vide:* Whitehead's "Science and the Modern World." Also, cf. Hollingworth's "The Psychology of Thought," and his keen-edged Articles in the *Journal of Philosophy,* 1916, and the *Psychologic Review,* 1924, 1925, on what he terms the "Psychophysical Continuum."

ing it good psychology (excellent, in sooth) to understand man as a product of analyzable social forces, and so understanding him, to devote our psychological devices and insights to an amelioration of his baffled and maladjusted state. This profound task of salvaging human nature by a psychologically wise re-formation of man's milieu (especially in its educational and social aspects) is the humble task set for itself by Mental Hygiene.

The socio-psychological view sponsored by Dewey represents, perhaps, the most mature insight available at present for our fruitful guidance. "We may desire abolition of war, industrial justice, greater equity of opportunity for all. But no amount of preaching good-will or the golden rule or cultivation of sentiments of love and equity will accomplish the results. There must be change in objective arrangements and institutions. We must work on the environment, not merely on the hearts of men. To think otherwise is to suppose that flowers can be raised in a desert or motor cars run in a jungle. Both things can happen and without a miracle. But only by first changing the jungle and the desert." [38]

In this connection I should like to quote a few excerpts from psychologic-minded psychiatrists, that illuminate the newer point of view: Dr. W. A. White says: "The psychoanalytic school has taught us how what appear to be well-marked constitutional character traits may be traced to early infantile fixations and how they may be modified by psychotherapy. I cannot help but think of certain instances among the lower animals where what would by common consent be considered hereditary characteristics can be produced as a laboratory experiment.

[38] "Human Nature and Conduct," a book that splendidly illustrates dynamic psychology as the equation of man and his realistic milieu.

For example, wingless insects can be made to develop wings if treated with magnesium salts and sugar in certain concentrations. Thyroid accelerates the development of tadpoles into frogs, while thymus causes giant tadpoles at the expense of differentiation. We are not yet in a position to be dogmatic about what is constitutional and inherited and what is acquired very early in life." [39]

Dr. Bernard Glueck writes: "In fact, according to Professor Jennings, one of the most eminent biologists of our day, research in the field of heredity has brought us to the point where we are justified in the belief that we can never know precisely what kind of person the offspring of any two parents is likely to be. This naturally does not apply to those cases of clear-cut germ-plasm degeneration with which we are familiar among the feeble-minded and constitutionally insane." [40]

Professor Walter F. Dearborn points out the salient distinction between the older and the newer conceptions of maladjustment: "The older conceptions of mental disorders gave but little hope of remedying; the newer conceptions are a challenge to the science of education and child training. Can we recognize during early school life the weaknesses, the faulty reactions and baneful influences which lead all too frequently to mental disorder and disaster in later life?" [41]

The simplest way of visualizing the "revolutionary" change that has occurred in "academic" psychology is to survey a list of recent texts, bearing in mind the contents

[39] "Symposium on the Psychopathic Individual," in *Mental Hygiene,* 1924, p. 176.

[40] "A Mental Hygiene of Childhood," in *Mental Hygiene,* 1924, p. 656.

[41] "Facts of Mental Hygiene for Teachers," in *Mental Hygiene,* 1919, p. 14.

and captions of the older books, even those of but fifteen years ago. For example, here is a group of excellently representative works which reveal quite clearly what the newer tendencies in psychology are:

| | |
|---|---|
| Thomson: | Instinct, Character and Intelligence |
| Ogden: | The Meaning of Psychology |
| Moore: | Dynamic Psychology |
| Wells: | Mental Adjustments |
| McDougall: | Outline of Abnormal Psychology |
| Burnham: | The Normal Mind |
| Martin: | The Behavior of Crowds |
| Roback: | Psychology and Behaviorism |
| Hollingworth: | The Psychology of Functional Neuroses |
| Watson: | Behaviorism |
| Woodworth: | Dynamic Psychology |
| Dunlap: | Social Psychology |
| Koehler (et al.): | Psychologies of 1925 |
| MacCurdy: | The Psychology of Emotion |
| Koffka | The Growth of the Mind. |

Professor B. H. Bode correctly states the matter as follows: "The familiar rubrics of sensation, perception, attention, and the like are conspicuously absent, and the discussion is centered on *mind as an instrument or function of adjustment.*" [42]

I return to my starting point. Mental Hygiene: The Quintessence of The New Psychology! So I venture to think.

In an impressive paragraph Prof. Brett gives it as his opinion that "The greatest condemnation that can be passed on a science is to make it the peculiar property of an individual; to speak of a psychology with the

[42] In a review of Thomson's book, *Mental Hygiene,* 1925, p. 836. [My italics.]

addition of its author's name as a sign of its character is to relegate psychology to the sphere of inventions. If it can be made a science, these distinctions must disappear in the gradual evolution of the one and only psychology." [43]

Does dynamic psychology, enriched by psychiatry, hold the possibility of the gradual evolution of the one and only psychology? Qui vivra, verra.

Once for all we must abandon the wholesale method of thinking, what I shall call the "lumping method" in the human sciences, and patiently dedicate ourselves to specific detailed analysis of specific problems of maladjustment. The *static* view of mental faculties, though repeatedly discredited in theoretic analysis, still holds dominant sway in the speculations and "scientific" generalizations of psychologists, psychiatrists, educators, and social scientists.

This lumping method is chiefly responsible for the evil eminence in the human sciences of such untenable doctrines as those parading under the rubric of instinct, heredity, mind, intelligence, will, consciousness, faculty, memory, personality, character, behavior, normality, abnormality, insanity, guilt, criminality, delinquency, psychopathic inferiority, constitutional predisposition,—a lexicon of dramatic and picturesque phraseology (all moral concepts, not scientific!),—impressive and quite misleading, and in concrete cases, painfully inapplicable and sterile withal.

The dark magic of labels has wrought an infinite mischief, more particularly in the socio-psychological fields of thought. What is it man seeks to accomplish by the use of these labels, these static conceptions of human

[43] "A History of Psychology," vol. iii, p. 154.

nature? Historically, the answer is only too clear: by these labels, by these static notions of life we cunningly contrive to doom our subordinate fellow men while elevating our own status by intellectualistic rationalization that is, in sober truth, a naïve species of self-glorification: as witness the "unconscious" assumption of those Intelligence Testers who, chancing to possess linguistic ability, assert too assuredly that verbal facility is the most adequate criterion of intelligence!

Or take the case of those psychologists, educators, and sociologists who resort to an intangible heredity (what do we *know* about heredity?) to account for so-called racial and social and individual differences which are plausibly explicable in terms of tangible social forces, of environmental factors. Anthropology and realistic economics and cultural history are the necessary correctives for such a bias. The point at issue is a simple, albeit a momentous one: "a priori" static assumptions about man and his potentialities do violence to the scientific point of view which proceeds on the humble assumption of possibilities, and ignores finalities. The *finalistic* state of mind is metaphysical and moral, though it uses science to bolster up its beliefs and pet prejudices. The *experimental* habit of mind eschews metaphysics and the moralistic bias, and concerns itself with tentative hypotheses, suspended judgments, tangible realities, *exploration of potentialities.* The lumping method seeks shortcuts to truth. But dogma is not science.

A most illuminating instance of the liberating power of the experimental as contrasted with the finalistic attitude of mind (which is still the reigning attitude in the human sciences, unfortunately so) is the discovery, by patient detailed observation and analysis, of the over-

whelming rôle of childhood, of babyhood, in truth, in the molding of human personality. Static presuppositions regarding heredity and innate characters could never have made possible so flexible and scientifically reasonable a conception of the organism. It is not too much to say that a new period has been promisingly opened up in the social sciences in general and in educational psychology in particular as a result of this experimental approach to human nature in terms of its specific potentialities. To the psychoanalytic and psychiatric insights into the vast meaning of childhood we are indebted for subduing the bogey of heredity. Psychology in becoming dynamic, becomes humanistic.

If it is permissible to envisage the history of psychology as essentially an evolution involving a metaphysical, physiological, and psychological stage, we can more clearly visualize the points of demarcation between the stages by noting characteristic features in each phase. The metaphysical psychologists from Aristotle to James Mill were deeply concerned with the nature of the soul. The physiological psychologists from Hartley to Muensterberg were as deeply absorbed in the nature of the brain. The psychological psychologists from Wundt to Cattell were primarily engaged in a study of the nature of behavior and experience.

In more concrete detail, the self-same analysis may be stated in this résumé:

(1) *Metaphysical Psychologists*

*Problems: the nature of the soul;* the nature of knowledge; the mind-body problem; the outer-inner relations; man as unique in nature;—chief stress on consciousness, rationality, ontology, *idealism,* meta-physicality.

(2) *Physiological Psychologists*

*Problems: the nature of the brain;* the reactions of the nervous system; the psycho-physiology of mental states; the mechanistic and reflex nature of the organism;—chief stress on activity, sense-organs, physiology and neurology, *materialism,* physicality.

(3) *Psychological Psychologists*

*Problems: the nature of behavior and experience;* the dynamic nature of mind; the complexity of behavior patterns; mental mechanisms; an analysis of emotions, drives, purposes, desires;—chief stress on "problems," abilities, individual differences, personality types, environmental factors; psycho-sociology, *humanism.*

In relation to what I have called stage three of psychological psychology it is necessary to insert a subdivision that branches out into three varieties which may not inappropriately be called, physiological behaviorism, psychological behaviorism, sociological behaviorism. Such a division will inevitably carry with it a certain arbitrariness; its usefulness is not therefore canceled out of existence.

*Three Varieties of Behaviorism:*

I. *Physiological Behaviorism*

Emphasis on Reflexes { Loeb, Pavlow, Bechterew, Watson, Lashley }

II. *Psychological Behaviorism*

Emphasis on Habits { Cattell, Thorndike, Woodworth, Terman, Dunlap }

III. *Psycho-Sociological Behaviorism*

Emphasis on Experiences { Dewey, Bode, Kantor, Bernard, Dearborn (W. F.)

Psychological psychology, the distinguishing mark of which is its dynamic quality, is, from whatever angle we view it, behavioristic; but behavioristic psychology itself undergoes an evolution from a relatively static to an emphatically kinetic conception of human nature depending upon an increasing absorption of the variety of experience into an increasingly dynamic conception of behavior.

## Chapter IX

# A PSYCHO-SEXUAL INVENTORY

Within the astonishingly brief period of less than fifteen years a most drastic revolution, medical and academic, has taken place in the world of the psychologists. The center of gravity has shifted from the intellectual to the emotional factors in behavior and experience. The recognition, the *realization,* that among the emotional factors none bulks so large, none is so ominously significant for harmonious personality-adjustment as *sex,* is but slowly and half-reluctantly (thanks to ancient puritanic taboos) penetrating the convictions of psychologic-minded persons, even the most academic. An astonishing revolution in values, forsooth!

The cordial attitude toward the "new psychology" (to limit ourselves only to the American group) of academic psychologists of the distinction of G. Stanley Hall, Joseph Jastrow, John B. Watson, L. L. Thurstone, F. L. Wells, Wilfrid Lay, Floyd H. Allport, William McDougall, to mention only a prominent few, is an impressive indication of the tendencies now vitally at work in psychology at large. We may graphically sum it all up by saying that psychology in achieving maturity, has become *psychiatrized.* "Integrated personality" is the magic phrase that emphasizes the positive aspect of the newer psychology, disintegrated or dissociated personality its negative aspect. Abnormal psychology has be-

come, inevitably, owing to a wider experience with concrete human nature in its dilemmas, frustrations and maladaptations, a branch of normal psychology. The "normal mind" is plainly a fiction. A knowledge of the psychiatric factors in human behavior has become indispensable to an intelligent study and a fruitful comprehension of personality, i.e. of the human organism as interrelated with its multiple environment. Psychology, in becoming dynamic and psychiatric, has simultaneously undergone humanization. The newer psychology is profoundly *humanistic.*

Intermediate between self-enclosed academic psychology, studying human behavior in a static and incomparably artificial milieu, and clinical psychology, observing human behavior, rather impressionistically, in an all too complicated "natural" milieu, there is the flourishing field of Mental Hygiene, a growing discipline that combines what is precious in academic psychology, viz., technique, method, control, scientific precision and caution, with what is admirable in clinical psychology, viz., personality-concepts, the humanistic approach, psychoanalytic subject-matter, qualitative investigation. Mental Hygiene typically represents that coördination of psychology and psychiatry which everyone concerned with the study of personality (and who among educators and psychologists and psychiatrists and social scientists is not!) hails as the promise and potency of the "humanization of knowledge,"—to borrow Professor Robinson's powerfully expressive phrase.

The enormous impulse toward researches in the realm of sex generated by the Freudian psychopathology and reinforced by the significant studies of Ellis, Moll, Krafft-Ebing, Forel, Ellen Key, Meisel-Hess, Long, Robie, et al.

has paved the way for a candor of treatment of the sexual factor in human behavior (and misbehavior) which bids fair to become the outstanding characteristic of the age in which we live. This unaffrighted candor in regard to sexual phenomena has captured the minds of some of the academic psychologists with the utterly wholesome result that sex in its normal and abnormal phases, has won a respectable place in modern psychological works: as witness the fine frankness of treatment of sex in Allport's "Social Psychology," Dunlap's "Social Psychology," Watson's "Behaviorism," Thorndike's Introduction to Moll's "The Sexual Life of the Child," Woodworth's "Some Criticisms of the Freudian Psychology," Miss Davenport's "The Sexual Interests of Adolescent Girls," Humphrey's "Education and Freudianism," F. L. Wells' "Mental Adjustments," Burnham's "The Normal Mind," Wilfrid Lay's "Man's Unconscious Conflict," McDougall's brilliant "Outline of Abnormal Psychology," not omitting the enlightening contributions to psychosexual wisdom of Morton Prince, Healy, Pressey, MacCurdy, Katherine B. Davis, Frankwood Williams, Helen T. Woolley, Macfie Campbell, Abraham Myerson, Miriam Van Waters, Miss Blanchard, Miss Richmond, William A. White, and in astonishing fact, of the whole psychoanalytic philosophy of human nature, purged and sanely reëdited to meet more humbly the meticulous requirements of scientific methodology.

Sex is no longer something which academic psychologists need to be afraid to handle as boldly (i.e. as dispassionately and objectively) as psychiatrists are now wont to do, and as "naturally" as they themselves have known how to handle sensory elements, after-images, differential limens, two-point thresholds, psychophysical determina-

tions, reaction time experiments, methods of studying memory, psychogalvanic reactions, color phenomena and conditioned responses. The scientific study of the sexual factor in human behavior (and in animal!-Vide: Moss' provocative "Study of Animal Drives") *may* prove, at the least, as meaningful to a mature psychology as Fechnerian experiments with lifted weights were to psychology in the days of its brilliant immaturity. Psychology arrives at maturity! The emotions have become reputable subject-matter for the sensitive science of psychology. Sex, no longer an outcast, enters the academic precincts in reasonably modest garb (as modest as this brazen-contemporary world goes) and is welcomed with more than a mere formalized cordiality. No vital psychologist will ever again emulate the prim Victorian example of Galton (for which relief much thanks to Jung, Freud and Company) who discontinued the use of the "free association" method because he feared whither it might lead into the intimate recesses of his mind too frankly laid bare by so drastic a research!

The excruciatingly minute study of organs, i.e. of *fragments of personality,* has happily abated somewhat in favor of the less precision-haunted but immeasurably more illuminating study of the organism, i.e. of *personality as a whole.* The organismic conception has recently proven its fruitfulness in the biology of Haldane, the metaphysics of Whitehead, the psychology of Dewey, McDougall, Kantor, Tolman, Thurstone, et al., the neurology of Herrick and of Child, the sociology of Barnes, and, last but not least, in the psychopathology of the Freudians especially as embodied in the Mental Hygiene Movement.

The bounds of candor have been wonderfully widened

by the newer psychology. Nothing is too sacred or intimate or squeamish for psychological analysis and experimentation. Psychology thus becomes the most *human* of sciences.

The following Questionnaire is sufficiently exhaustive to be of value to educators, psychologists, mental hygienists, students of personality, psychoanalysts, in short, to all those who seek to understand the emotional factors in human nature. Of course each investigator can be guided in his selection of questions by the nature of the task he has in view. Since the whole problem is still in the pioneering stage of rather crude experimentalism, it is important at present merely to stir a wider interest in the use of such a Questionnaire (especially on the part of educators and psychologists who are persuaded of the high importance of a "Psycho-Clinic" in every institution of learning) and to publish the results so that in due time adequate data may be assembled for purposes of fruitful comparison and final standardization.

The significant Questionnaire studies in psycho-sexuality of Katherine B. Davis, Peck and Wells, P. S. Achilles and Dr. Exner are too well known to need any further comment here. The elaborate study of Dr. Hamilton, which promises to be the most significant of all, is still in process of fact-and-phantasy finding and is alluded to because of its enormous possibilities for psycho-sexual reëducation. Another promising investigation is being conducted at Teachers' College under the supervision of Dr. Watson and Mr. Chassell.[1]

[1] Because of the appreciative interest in this "Psycho-Sexual Inventory" on the part of such authoritative persons as Dr. Beatrice Hinkle, Dr. Lyman F. Wells, Dr. A. A. Brill, Professor R. S. Woodworth, Professor Elliott (of the Theological Seminary), Dr. Exner, Dr. K. B. Davis, and Dr. Hamilton, I have thought it worth while to submit it for more

## A Basis for the Study of the Normal Sex Life of Young Men (Unmarried)

At what age did you begin to ask questions about sex?

As a child were you interested in watching elders undress?

At what age were you eager to know what the genitals of the other sex looked like?

At what age did you begin to be troubled by how a child is born?

At what age did you become curious about your own sex organs?

What one sexual fact were you most curious about between (approximately) ages 12 to 15?

At what age did you wonder what sex organs are for?

In which have you been more interested: male or female sex organs?

Has your interest in female sex organs been at any time overwhelmingly strong?

What one sexual fact were you most curious about at (approximately) ages 16 to 18?

At what age was your curiosity about sex most keen?

Is your curiosity still unsatisfied?

general use among the increasing group of those psychologically-oriented investigators who are eager to contribute toward the expansion of the Mental Hygiene movement in our institutions of learning.

Those who have become acquainted with Dr. Hamilton's thoroughgoing Questionnaire will appreciate how significantly it has (albeit "unconsciously") influenced mine.

It need hardly be added that the Inventory may be (and perhaps more satisfactorily) presented in three divisions embracing Childhood, Adolescence, Adulthood. That was my first choice, but after several conferences with advisers I recast the Questionnaire to conform more nearly to the topical arrangement.

What sex fact are you still curious about?
Do references to sex stir your curiosity?
What one sexual fact were you most curious about between (approximately) ages 18 to 22?

Did you look upon dirty talk as shameful?
Did you think of any acts as shameful?
What acts in particular were you ashamed of before puberty?
Is the toilet associated in your memories with sexual shame?
Why did you feel ashamed of sex?
Did you get the impression in childhood that love-making is shameful?
At what age did you (somehow) feel ashamed of your body?
Was undressing associated with shame?
When as a child you jumped about naked (or partly so), were you greeted with "Shame, Shame"?
Were you frequently undressed as a little boy in the presence of girls?
Did you care whether girls or boys saw you undressing?
At what age did you feel ashamed to undress in the presence of another person?
At what age did you begin to feel bashful?
What experience (or occurrence) made you ashamed of your body?
Have you a vivid recollection of an early experience of shame?
Narrate it briefly.
Were there some questions about sex you were ashamed to ask your parents to answer?
Name them.

Were you ashamed to learn that you had sex desire?
Do you still feel ashamed of nocturnal emissions ("pollutions")?
Has experiencing sex desire made you feel a sense of guilt?

Did you try to engage in the sex act before puberty?
How did you first become acquainted with masturbation ("self-abuse")?
Did you ever see another boy masturbate?
Did you have the impression that only bad boys masturbate?
Did you believe that only boys masturbated?
Did a boy ever deliberately expose his sex organs in your presence?
Did a girl ever expose her sex organs in your presence?
Did you witness much kissing, love-making, among older members of the family?
Would you say that you were seriously conscious of sex by age 14?
At what age did you first masturbate?
Did masturbation usually bring you a feeling of buoyancy or of depression?
Were you disturbed by sex tensions during adolescence?
What particular sex problem troubled you in adolescence?
What was your attitude in adolescence toward the other sex: like, dislike, or indifference?
When did you become interested in the sex act?
At what age did you seek to know how the sex act is performed?
Did experiencing erections make you feel ashamed?
Does talk about sex tend to stir you sexually?

Does reading about sex tend to stir you sexually?
At what age were you very sensitive sexually?
Did sex ever seem like a force you had to contend with?
At what age did you hope to marry?
Do you think of sex as something unclean?
At what age did you experience nocturnal emissions?
Did you think they were doing you harm?
Did you feel sinful because of them?
Did you try to forget them?
Did you know anything about the physiology of emissions?
At what age did you first hear of "pollutions"?
Did the very word "pollutions" suggest something shameful?
Are you interested in how the sex act is performed?
Does attending "musical comedies or revues" stir you sexually?
Does attending vaudeville shows stir you sexually?
Does attending the movies stir you sexually?
Does attending the "legitimate" drama stir you sexually?
At what age did you begin to be seriously troubled by the sex problem?
Do you look upon the modern college girl as likely to make a good companion in marriage?
Is there any alternative to marriage that you approve? What is it?

Are you acquainted with the facts of Birth Control?
What is the source of your information?
If there were a psychologic Clinic in your Institution of Learning, would you consult it?
What special problems would you care to discuss? Num-

ber in the order of importance. (1.=most important, 8=least important).

Masturbation
Venereal Diseases
Reverie (Day dreaming)
Mental Conflicts
Women
Marriage
Sex Life in General
Birth Control

Mention any other Special Problem you might care to discuss in a private conference at the Psychologic Clinic.

Is there any problem more important to you than sex?

If there is, name it.

Would you get married now, if you could afford to?

Would getting married now help you to pursue your work (studies) with more peace of mind?

How do you solve your problem of sexual tensions?

Do you look upon masturbation as a harmful practice?

Have your studies suffered from the interference of personal sex problems?

Did companionship with boys have anything to do with your masturbating?

Did companionship with girls have anything to do with your masturbating?

Did companionship with boys help to increase or decrease the practice?

Did companionship with girls help to increase or decrease the practice?

Has your sex life thus far been satisfactory or unsatisfactory?

Do you include yourself among those who are troubled by the sex problem?

Do you find yourself frequently thinking of sex love?

If you were giving a course in Sexual Enlightenment to young men of your own age, what problems would you stress? Enumerate and evaluate them. (1=most important)

At what age did you feel yourself ready for sex love?

How many years have elapsed since then?

How have you made your peace with sex desire?

Do you find self-control an urgent problem?

Do you feel within you a pent-up love-life that has no adequate outlet?

Was your attachment before puberty stronger to your mother or your father?

Was your attachment during adolescence stronger to your mother or your father?

Were you more attached before puberty to sister or brother?

Were you more attached during adolescence to sister or brother?

Were you ever jealous of either parent?

Why were you jealous of your mother (or father)?

Did you get the impression that love-making is wrong for unmarried people?

Did you ever find fault with your sister for going with boys?

Why?

What was your attitude during adolescence toward masturbation: approval, disapproval?

Which sex, as a boy, did you think of as purer, male or female?

Which sex, as a young man, do you think of as purer, male or female?

Did you think of your sister (or sisters) as purer than other girls?

Do you think of prostitution as a "necessary evil"?

Did you ever think of masturbation ("self-abuse") as immoral?

Do you think so now?

Does a knowledge of Birth Control tend to undermine the morals of young people?

Have you been afraid to make love to women because of your respect for your mother?

Have you been afraid to make love to women because of your respect for your sisters?

Do you think that young men are subjected to too much sexual stimulation nowadays?

Can you think of yourself as falling in love with a prostitute?

If there were no public disapproval of your behavior, would you prefer to live in a "free love" relation rather than in marriage?

If you could forget your mother (and sisters), would you be more forward with women?

Trying to be perfectly honest with yourself, state frankly which of the following factors keeps you from indulgence in sexual intercourse: (Number them in the order of their influence, 1=most influential; 10=least influential)

Fear of being found out.
Fear of venereal disease.
Conscience (moral considerations).
Lack of opportunity.

Indifference to women.
Preoccupation with studies and with work.
Absence of desire.
Other, safer forms of sex gratification.
Fear of conception.
Love of a girl (actually or as an ideal).

Do you think of a fellow who has visited a prostitute as immoral?
Do you believe in marriage as the best solution of the sex problem?
Is the sex relation before marriage immoral?
Is the sex relation, extra-maritally, immoral?
Which do you consider more immoral: adultery or murder?
Which do you consider more immoral: adultery or prostitution?

Do you object to listening to "smutty" jokes?
Do you like to listen to "plain talk" about sex?
Do you consider yourself passionate?
Can a man love a woman without lust?
Are love and lust essentially different?
Do you think of passion as lust or love?
Will Birth Control increase the opportunities for lust?
Will Birth Control increase the opportunities for love?
Do you generally think of your own sex desire as love?
Does "spooning" stir a man's lust?

Can marriage transform lust into love?
Can marriage transform love into lust?
Are men more prone to lust than women?
Are women more prone to love than men?

Do you generally think of another man's sex desire as lust?

Are you afraid of sex experience?

Underline which of the following experiences once looked upon by you as wrong or immoral are no longer thought so:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| kissing | attending sex plays | adultery |
| flirting | masturbating | reading sex literature |
| spooning | mating (without marriage) | enjoying jokes about sex |
| smoking | divorce | |
| drinking | | |

Up until what age did you consider such experiences (as those just referred to) as wrong or immoral?

At what age did you begin to change your mind?

Would you marry a woman who is not a virgin?

Is virginity in a man as important as virginity in a woman?

Did you ever undergo the experience of considering a desire or wish (for example, concerning sex love) as evil and later, upon coming into more personal contact with it, finding it not-evil?

Have you a sceptical attitude toward woman's virtue?

Is sex desire as such evil?

Should sex love be used only for producing children?

Is sex love for its own sake immoral?

Up until what age did you sleep in your mother's bed?

Up until what age did you sleep in your mother's room?

Were your questions on sex frankly answered by your parents?

When you went to the toilet (at school) did you ever hear dirty talk?

Were your parents very much in love with each other?
Did you hear a lot of talk at home about sex?
Did you get any information about sex from your mother?
Did you get any information about sex from your father?
Did you get any information about sex from any other member of the family?
Did you get any information about sex from the servant girl?
Did you get any information about sex from your boy companions?
Did you get any information about sex from books or pamphlets.
Did you ever consult the dictionary for "dirty" words (concerning sex)?
Did a teacher ever talk to you about sex (in the elementary school)?
When you first got to know of sex love, did you think of it as indecent?
Did seeing a woman nurse a baby make you sex-conscious?
Did anyone ever suggest to you that you visit a prostitute?
Where did the suggestion come from: a book, a physician, a friend?
Did you receive any warnings about "temptation"?
From whom did these warnings come?
Did you ever find it possible to talk frankly about sex with either parent?
Which parent did you ever talk to about sex?
Have you read books giving advice on sex to males?
Have you read books giving advice on sex to females?
Have such books helped you to solve any sex problem?

Did attending a co-educational school make you more sex-conscious?

Were your companions in adolescence usually boys or girls or both?

For how long a period were you curious about sex?

Did any boy ever show you obscene pictures?

Did any girl ever show you obscene pictures?

Did you ever buy any obscene pictures?

Did you ever carry around with you any obscene pictures?

Did you ever go swimming naked, alone?

Did you ever go swimming naked, with other boys?

Were you glad to be naked?

Did anyone make any "wisecracks" about sex on such occasions?

Did you think of these "wisecracks" as dirty?

Have you frequently heard references to girls that struck you as not nice?

Was your attitude toward girls when you first began to go with them, one of boldness or shyness?

Did any girl ever humiliate you?

Did any girl ever ridicule you?

Did you look upon yourself as attractive to girls?

Has any experience or relation made you think of sex as beautiful?

Has any experience or relation made you think of sex as low?

Did you ever think there was something shameful (indecent) about toilet functions?

Did you somehow link toilet functions with sex functions?

Did anybody try to explain the sex act to you?

Who tried to explain it to you?

Underline which one influence is most responsible for present-day frankness in sex matters?

*a*) The Theatre (including the Movies, etc.)
*b*) Sex Literature
*c*) Freedom of women (including dress, sports, drink, etc.)
*d*) Birth Control
*e*) Postponement of marriage

Has the reading of books on psychoanalysis harmed your self-control sexually?

Has the reading of books on psychoanalysis influenced your sex practices?

Has the influence been essentially good or bad?

Do you look upon marriage as a relation you believe in and want, or a relation you do not believe in but can't escape?

When you read or hear the word "womb," do you think of it as having vulgar (or indecent or smutty) associations?

When you read or hear the word "pregnancy," do you think of it as having vulgar (or indecent or smutty) associations?

Does the idea of *mating* strike you as being a rather low experience?

Would you be ashamed to mention *womb* in conversation with a boy friend?

Would you be ashamed to mention *penis* in conversation with a boy friend?

When you read or hear the word "penis" do you think of it as having vulgar (or indecent or smutty) associations?

Would you be ashamed to mention *womb* in conversation with a girl friend?

Would you be ashamed to mention *penis* in conversation with a girl friend?

Does the latter-day mode of dressing of women disturb you sexually?

At what age did the problem of finding it difficult to fall asleep because of sex thoughts first trouble you?

Have you ever seen paintings of nudes (female)?

Did they interest you?

Did they seem inspiring or rather degrading?

Have you ever seen sculptures of nudes (female)?

Did they seem inspiring or degrading?

Are you fond of looking at magazines (or newspapers) that display the female form?

Does the nude female form (in reality or in imagination) fascinate you?

Are you attracted to musical comedies by the display of the female form?

Do you like to attend "leg shows"?

Has any girl ever inspired you?

Has any girl made you feel a contempt for sex?

Did you get the impression that the sex relation is necessary for the preservation of health?

Did you believe it?

Are you the only child?

Do you think you were somewhat neurotic in childhood?

Do you think you have been somewhat neurotic since adolescence?

By age 14 did you have a sweetheart?

Did you like being with girls?

Were you ever a witness before puberty to a scene of sexual behavior?

Name the sexual behavior you witnessed.

At what age did you become acquainted with the nature of female sex organs?

How did you come to know the difference between the sex organs of boys and girls?

Mention a few facts about sex you knew (or thought you knew) at puberty—about age 14.

During adolescence, did you ever see another boy manipulating his sex organs?

What experience first made you eager to know more about sex?

When did you begin to discuss sex with boy friends?

When did you begin to discuss sex with girl friends?

How did you first learn of venereal diseases?

At what age did you become interested in sex love?

At what age did you become conscious of sex attraction?

Where did you get your knowledge as to how babies are born?

Did you ever have the experience of not being able to sleep because of sex thoughts?

At what age did you begin to have intimate girl friends?

Did you ever have a frank conversation about sex with a girl (or woman)?

When did the problem of prostitution interest you?

Did sitting next to a girl seem strange?

At what age did you find the companionship of girls normal?

Did being in a class with girls disturb you sexually (at times)?

At what age were you most sex-conscious in the presence of girls?

At what age did your dreams become sexual in character?
Did a sexual dream leave you feeling buoyant or depressed?
Was your very first experience with masturbating pleasant?
At about what age?
At what age, particularly, did you do any "daydreaming" of a sexual character?
Have you been interested in girls in general?
Have you been interested in one girl in particular?
Have you been eager to make love to many girls?
Have you been eager to make love to one girl in particular?
Up until what age were you ashamed to kiss a girl?
Why were you ashamed?
Up until what age were you afraid to kiss a girl?
Why were you afraid?
Did you make love to girls in the privacy of your imagination?
What experience first made you aware that you had sex desire?
Did you believe that girls also had sex desire?
Did you ever visit a prostitute?
Did you ever, during adolescence, witness a scene of sexual behavior?
Describe it.
At what age did breasts particularly attract your attention?
Did you ever find yourself "peeping" (so as to see a woman's body)?
At about what age did you begin to have sex dreams?
Did a sexual reverie usually leave you feeling buoyant or depressed?

Mention a few facts about sex you knew in adolescence, i.e., by age 18 or so.

Does dancing tend to stir you sexually?

At what age did you first clearly experience an orgasm?

What provoked it?

Did the experiencing of the orgasm frighten you?

Did it interest you?

Did it give you a sense of pleasure or pain?

Did it create a moral problem for you?

Underline which one of these alternatives you sincerely think is the most satisfactory solution of the "sex problem" in youth:

Masturbation
Prostitution
Abstinence and self-control
The mistress relation (free love)
Marriage

Underline which of *these* alternatives you sincerely think is the most satisfactory solution of the "sex problem" in youth:

Absorption in one's work
Love of mother
"Homosexual" friendship
Sublimation (substitute activity)
Religious devotion (prayer, etc.)

Has sex seemed like a force that both attracts and repels you?

Have you found yourself troubled by moods?

Have these moods had anything to do with the "problem of women"?

Has your experience with girls made you feel a dual attitude toward them: one of tenderness and one of hostility?

Did being in love make you feel sex-conscious?

Did being in love make you feel ashamed?

Did being in love make you feel proud?

Did being in love make you feel irritable?

Did being in love make you feel angry?

Did being in love make you feel meek?

Did being in love make you feel cruel?

Did being in love make you wonder about the sex life of members of your family?

Which member in particular: mother, father, sister, brother?

Did you ever hear of the statement that masturbation may lead to insanity?

Did you believe this statement?

Did it frighten you?

Did you ever visit a physician concerning a sex problem?

Did you ever find yourself going through "psychical sexual intercourse" (i.e. performing the sex act in imagination)?

At what age did you notice yourself indulging in imaginary sexual love?

Was the practice a persistent one, hard to shake off?

Have you ever been solicited by a prostitute?

Has a refined girl ever offered herself to you (without marriage)?

Do you find difficulty in sticking to your decision to be indifferent to sex?

Did any experience disgust you with sex?

What experience or fact first made you associate sex with disgust?

Has your acquaintance with sex made you feel that "sex" is unclean?
Do you prefer the company of young men to that of young women?
Do "petting" parties tend to overstimulate young men sexually?
Has your interest in sex increased considerably in recent years?
Were you ever punished because of sex activity of any kind?
Were you ever disappointed in a love affair?
Has any sex problem (or experience) ever depressed you?
Are you rather easily attracted to women (or girls)?
Up until what age did you find it easy to get along without thinking about sex?
Up until what age did you succeed in remaining a "virgin"?
Did any girl ever try to rush you into sex behavior?
Are there times when you fall in love with the virility or handsomeness of your own body?
Do women try to make love to you?
Did you ever write passionate love letters?
Do you find yourself, repeatedly, sliding into states of reverie in which you make love to beautiful women?
Do you ever feel the impulse to worship women?
Did a girl or woman ever tell you about her sex life?
Are you sensitive to women's charms?

Do you think that current theatrical productions are too sexual in theme?
Do you believe that man is monogamous?
Do you look upon divorce with approval or disapproval?
Do you believe that woman is monogamous?

Would you allow woman the same "privileges" in sex behavior as you do man?

Do you believe in the "double standard" of morals?

Do you believe that man is "by nature" polygamous?

Is "jazz" life inducing sexual immodesty in young women?

What is your attitude toward "free love": approval or disapproval?

Is "jazz" life harming the sex idealism of young men?

Would you extend to your sister the same rights of freedom in sex behavior as you claim for yourself?

Do you find it difficult to think of a woman except as a sex object?

Is sex a mystery to you?

Are girls mysteries to you?

Do you approve of Special Courses on Sex Enlightenment in our colleges?

Do you think it desirable to have Psychologic Clinics in our Institutions of Learning?

Is frankness concerning Sex Problems harmful or beneficial to young men?

Is frankness concerning Sex Problems harmful or beneficial to young women?

Does the subject of Sex interest you a lot?

Which of these expressions strikes you as most objectionable? Which least objectionable? (Number them: 1=most; 5=least objectionable):

Mating
Sex union
Sex love
Sex embrace
Sex intercourse

Do you believe that there are some aspects of sex too sacred to talk about?

Which in particular?

Is modern dancing at all responsible for moral looseness among young women?

Is modern dancing at all responsible for moral looseness among young men?

Do you believe that love of mother is a force that can aid a young man's self-control?

Is it your opinion that the modern young woman is loose morally?

Would you say that the "sex problem" is of major or of minor importance in a fellow's life?

Have you ever had a course especially devoted to Sexual Enlightenment?

Number in the order of importance (1=most important; 6=least important) which of the following problems such a course (if given) should emphasize:

Auto-erotic practices
Venereal diseases
Perversions
Psychology of sex
Methods of preventing conception
Marriage (and parenthood)

Is co-education a wholesome thing, sexually?

What are the best ages for co-education?

Do you believe that sexual problems are essentially matters of morals or matters of hygiene?

If you had the power, would you like to eliminate sex-activity from your life?

Do you feel yourself intellectually superior to sex desire?

At what age should sexual enlightenment begin?
Is it normal for a decent young man to have sex relations (before marriage)?
Is it normal for a decent young woman to have sex relations (before marriage)?
Do you think of girls as "easy marks" (sexually)?
Is the "flapper" a type of girl to be ashamed of?
Is it your opinion that the young men and young women of today take the sex relation lightly?
Is the new freedom of women a sign of progress, morally?
Do you believe in a moral censorship of the Stage?
Do you believe in a moral censorship of the Screen?
Do you believe in a moral censorship of literature?
Should literature discuss the intimacies of sex?
Is Birth Control moral?
Do you generally think of yourself as superior to woman?
Do you generally think of yourself as inferior to woman?
Do you generally think of yourself as the equal of woman?
Have you tended to associate sex with sin?
Have you the ambition to be a great lover?
Do you think of the seminal fluid with admiration, disgust, or indifference?
Do you look upon the sexual act as a fine experience?
Did you ever think of yourself as oversexed?
Did you ever think of yourself as undersexed?
Do you feel yourself emotionally equipped to be happy in marriage?
Does an increasing experience with sex (as literature or life) make you respect it the more?
Do you look upon sexual thoughts (reverie) as a species of auto-eroticism?

Do you prefer reading an interesting book to being with a girl?

Are you more at ease in discussing sex problems now than you were several years ago?

## Chapter X

# THE PROBLEM OF CHILDHOOD

It might be interesting to consider the result that recurs in the several experimental studies of this research,[1] viz., the existence of an abnormal situation in the childhood of the apparent normals and of a normal situation in the childhood of the declared psychoneurotics.

It may interest the reader to glance at the inventory used in the research on the basis of which the conclusions reached in the special chapter entitled The Problem of Childhood are founded. The italicised questions represent those which were included in a second experiment by the method of a statistical discrimination as between the psychoneurotic and the normal frequencies of response. At any rate, the questions here appended are interesting in themselves from a psychological and educational point of view.

### *Part A: Questionnaire On Childhood*

Note: You will assume that each of these statements is prefaced by the remark:

This Problem Has Occurred Before Puberty.

1. *Poor health (i.e., lack of energy, no "pep").*
2. Periods of sleeplessness.

[1] Those who care to pursue this subject further may find complete data and interpretations in the writer's research entitled, "A Mental Hygiene Inventory" (A Contribution to Dynamic Psychology), *Archives of Psychology,* No. 88, Columbia University.

3. *Fright in the middle of the night.*
4. *Tiredness.*
5. Fits of dizziness.
6. Queer, unpleasant feelings in my body.
7. *Bad pains in some part of my body.*
8. *Fainting.*
9. Loss of memory for a time.
10. *Unfair treatment on the part of teachers.*
11. A strong desire to run away from home.
12. Difficulty in making friends.
13. Masturbation (so-called self-abuse).
14. A "mental" shock.
15. A sense of uneasiness in crossing a high bridge.
16. Getting rattled easily.
17. A sense of uneasiness in going into a tunnel or subway.
18. *Being unable to sit still without fidgeting.*
19. A sense of uneasiness in crossing a wide street or square.
20. *Mind-wandering (i.e., losing track of what I was doing).*
21. A desire to jump off when on a high place.
22. A sense of uneasiness in sitting in a small room with the door shut.
23. *A fear of fire.*
24. A desire to go and set fire to something.
25. *Habit of biting my fingernails.*
26. *A desire to steal things.*
27. The habit of stuttering.
28. A poor appetite (for food).
29. The habit of twitching my face, neck or shoulders.
30. *Shyness.*
31. Getting angry easily.

32. Slow to be provoked to laughter.
33. Getting cross or grouchy easily.
34. Getting tired of amusements easily.
35. *Swift change of my interests.*
36. *Shift of my moods from happy to sad and sad to happy (without reason).*
37. Heart trouble.
38. A desire to commit suicide.
39. Standing pain with difficulty.
40. Feeling sad or low-spirited.
41. Convulsions.
42. Anemia.
43. Dyspepsia.
44. A nervous breakdown.
45. Dislike of outdoor life.
46. Fear of dogs.
47. *Being a "crank" about food.*
48. *Harboring intense dislikes of people.*
49. Being rather uncommunicative.
50. *Fear of snakes.*
51. Being "moody".
52. *Wanting to get even with someone who had wronged me.*
53. *Giving way to "tantrums" when my will was balked.*
54. *"Day-dreaming" in the midst of my work or studies.*
55. *Fear of mice or rats.*
56. *Being frightened (or worried) by a sex fact or experience.*
57. *Carrying around with me (privately) a sense of inferiority.*
58. Feeling of shyness.

59. Experiencing conflicting moods of love and hate for members of my family.
60. Feeling of self-consciousness because of my personal appearance.
61. Lack of self-confidence.
62. *Disliking the company of girls (or women).*
63. *Considering myself a rather nervous person.*
64. Feeling fatigued rather easily.
65. Experiencing periods of loneliness.
66. Being made unhappy by a sex problem.
67. *Being depressed because I received low marks in school.*
68. Saying things on the spur of the moment and then regretting them.
69. Fear of lightning.
70. Getting discouraged easily.
71. Losing my temper quickly.
72. *Feeling ashamed of myself for having an interest in my body.*
73. Just feeling miserable.
74. Being afraid of being thought stupid.
75. Problem of constipation.
76. Suffering from nightmare.
77. Periods of unhappiness in puberty and adolescence.
78. Being looked upon as "bad" at home or in school.
79. *My liking to play alone rather than with others.*
80. Being timid with other fellows.

*Part B: Questionnaire On Maturity*

Note: You will assume that each of these statements is prefaced by the remark:

THIS PROBLEM HAS OCCURRED SINCE PUBERTY.

81. Experiencing sexual dreams.
82. Ideas running through my head, preventing sleep.
83. Feeling fatigued in the morning.
84. Being subject to eye pains.
85. Things swimming or getting misty before my eyes.
86. Embarrassed by blushing.
87. Bothered by fluttering of the heart.
88. Feeling an awful pressure in or about the head.
89. Suffering from headaches.
90. Having had an arm or leg temporarily paralyzed.
91. Being unhappy during my adolescent years.
92. Ill-treatment by my folk.
93. A feeling that someone is trying to do me harm.
84. The belief that people find fault with me.
95. Ill-treatment by my employers.
96. Indifference to girls.
97. Difficulty in adjusting to new places.
98. The feeling that someone was making me act against my will.
99. The fear of being crushed in a crowd.
100. Difficulty in knowing what I want to do next.
101. Being easily upset (or made irritable) .
102. The feeling that people are reading my thoughts.
103. Worrying too much about little things.

104. Being bothered by some particular useless thought that keeps coming into my mind.
105. The queer feeling as if I were not my old self.
106. Worrying too much when I have an unfinished job on my hands.
107. Being afraid of responsibilities.
108. Getting tired of work quickly.
109. The feeling that things are not real.
110. Difficulty in making up my mind.
111. The fear of going insane.
112. Difficulty of standing the sight of blood.
113. Being troubled with the idea that people are watching me on the street.
114. Difficulty of standing disgusting smells.
115. Difficulty in doing good work while people are looking on.
116. Tendency of my thoughts to link sex experience with disgust.
117. Being worried lest I had made an unfavorable impression on people.
118. Being riled by criticism of my opinions.
119. Finding that people get on my nerves.
120. Being made angry by criticism of my person.
121. Having the habit of contradicting people.
122. Suspecting people of "underhanded" motives.
123. Finding my sex life unsatisfactory.
124. Having the habit of self-depreciation.
125. Finding myself recalling painful experiences.
126. Being indifferent to women as a sex.
127. Difficulty of standing a lot of "kidding".
128. Being "touchy" on various subjects.
129. Finding my mind racked by doubt.
130. Maladjustment to life.

131. Difficulty in concentrating on my studies (or work) because of having "girls on the brain".
132. Having my dearest friendships with men.
133. Being ashamed to talk frankly about my sex life.
134. Feeling unequal to accomplishing my major ambitions.
135. The habit of pointing out people's faults.
136. Being troubled by conscience problems.
137. A conflict in my nature between sex and morals.
138. Difficulty in forgetting unpleasant experiences.
139. Feeling life a great burden.
140. Finding my home environment unhappy.
141. Being unenthusiastic about my life's possibilities.
142. Feeling a sense of remorse.
143. Egotism (i.e., conceit).

NOTE: The young men in the various colleges where this study was undertaken were given special printed Forms containing the questions listed above for the period of Childhood (up to age 14) and the period of Maturity (since age 14) and had to indicate by means of a simple check mark in the appropriate box whether they had experienced the maladjustment in question in an extreme or moderate form, or not at all. Hence, they used three categories labeled: "Yes Ext."; "Yes Mod."; "No." On the basis of the results statistically considered, students could then be chosen for personal follow-up conferences of a preventive mental hygiene nature.

The questionnaire used for the first group of psychoneurotics and of normals contained 80 questions in childhood, whereas the revised inventory used for the second group of "subjects" contained 30 questions in childhood. Of course, the separate groups of normals represent the use of 30 questions in the childhood period.

The average frequency as well as the per cent average frequency are calculated on the basis of the number of questions, i.e., 80 and 30 respectively.

SUMMARY OF DATA ON CHILDHOOD

| *Groups* | *No. Cases* | *Av. Freq.* | *Av. F.* | *Ext.* | *Mod.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. 1st Group of Psychoneurotics | 50 | 18.68 | 23% | 6 | 17 |
| II. 1st Group of Normals..... | 140 | 25.50 | 32% | 7 | 25 |
| †(*a*) 1st "Random" Gr.: Normals ..... | 50 | 20.74 | 26 | 6 | 20 |
| †(*b*) 2nd "Random" Gr.: Normals ..... | 50 | 29.34 | 36 | 8 | 29 |
| III. 2nd Group of Psychoneurotics | 70 | 6.94 | 23% | 6 | 17 |
| IV. 2nd Group of Normals..... | 400 | 11.87 | 39% | 8 | 31 |
| ††(*a*) 1st "Random" Gr.: Normals ..... | 70 | 11.73 | 39 | 7 | 32 |
| ††(*b*) 2nd "Random" Gr.: Normals ..... | 70 | 11.70 | 39 | 7 | 32 |
| ††(*c*) 3rd "Random" Gr.: Normals ..... | 70 | 12.23 | 41 | 7 | 34 |
| V. Separate Groups of Normals: | | | | | |
| 1. West Point ..... | 102 | 10.77 | 35% | 6 | 29 |
| 2. Princeton ..... | 57 | 11.03 | 37 | 6 | 31 |
| 3. Harvard ..... | 76 | 10.14 | 34 | 6 | 28 |
| 4. Fordham ..... | 57 | 12.01 | 40 | 6 | 34 |
| 5. N. Y. U..... | 78 | 12.65 | 42 | 8 | 34 |
| 6. C. C. N. Y..... | 97 | 12.90 | 43 | 10 | 33 |

† *Sources of "Random" Groups of 50:*

1st Group:
30: from top of list of 140
20: from bottom: list of 140

2nd Group:
50: from middle of list of 140

†† *Sources of "Random" Groups of 70.*

| | *1st Group* | *2nd Group* | *3rd Group* |
|---|---|---|---|
| West Point.... | 15 | 15 | 10 |
| Princeton ..... | 15 | 15 | 10 |
| Fordham ..... | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| N. Y. U..... | 15 | 15 | 10 |
| C. C. N. Y.... | 15 | 15 | 10 |
| Harvard ..... | .. | .. | 20 |
| | 70 | 70 | 70 |

A noteworthy point, disclosed by these summaries of the average frequencies in childhood and maturity, is this: in childhood, though the frequencies for the normals exceed somewhat those for the psychoneurotics in "extreme" symptom-response, the average frequencies

for the normals in *"moderate"* symptom-response are from 50 to 100% greater than those for the psychoneurotics. This situation is reversed in the average frequencies for maturity.

SUMMARY OF DATA ON MATURITY

(In Terms of *Total* Frequencies and Percentages)

| *Groups* | *No. Cases* | *Av. Freq.* | *Av.F.* | *Ext.* | *Mod.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. Psychoneurotics (1st Group)†. | 50 | 73.98 | 52% | 18 | 34 |
| II. Normals (1st Group)†..... | 140 | 50.80 | 35% | 7 | 28 |
| (*a*) "Random" Group (1st)... | 50 | 48.66 | 34 | 7 | 27 |
| (*b*) "Random" Group (2nd).. | 50 | 52.78 | 37 | 7 | 30 |
| III. Psychoneurotics (2nd Group)†† | 70 | 38.13 | 54% | 20 | 34 |
| IV. Normals (2nd Group)††..... | 400 | 25.09 | 36% | 6 | 30 |
| (*a*) "Random" Group (1st)... | 70 | 24.80 | 35 | 5 | 30 |
| (*b*) "Random" Group (2nd).. | 70 | 23.73 | 34 | 6 | 28 |
| (*c*) "Random" Group (3rd) .. | 70 | 24.93 | 35 | 5 | 30 |
| V. Separate Groups of Normals:†† | | | | | |
| 1. West Point[1] ..... | 102 | 20.98 | 30% | 3 | 27 |
| 2. Princeton[1] ..... | 57 | 21.24 | 30 | 5 | 25 |
| 3. Harvard[1] ..... | 76 | 21.11 | 30 | 5 | 25 |
| 4. Fordham ..... | 57 | 26.70 | 38 | 7 | 31 |
| 5. N. Y. U..... | 78 | 25.80 | 37 | 5 | 32 |
| 6. C. C. N. Y..... | 97 | 30.31 | 43 | 9 | 34 |

† = 143 Q.
†† = 70 Q.

All the ratios (except V:6) between the Psychoneurotics and the Normals are approximately 3:2 or better, i.e., nicely discriminatory—in a statistical sense.

[1] Precisely, the percentages are: West Point .299, Harvard .301, Princeton .303.

As we see clearly by glancing at the percentages listed above, the average frequencies representing "moderate" symptom-response are not greatly different from one another, and the small differences are in the direction of

the group of psychoneurotics. But the average frequencies representing "extreme" symptom-response are from 2½ to almost 7 times as great among the psychoneurotics as among the normals. The true basis of discrimination is found in the "extreme" symptoms, *in maturity.* An interesting contrast to the situation in childhood.

## The Childhood Situation

It is offhand rather surprising that the period of "childhood" (spanning the ages up to puberty) of the abnormals should be so much more innocent of psychoneurotic involvement than the "childhood" of the normals. As the data indicate quite clearly, not even one question out of the eighty listed for childhood yields the clean-cut discriminatory ratio of 2:1 as between declared psychoneurotics and unselected normals. Only one question, number 72., gives even a ratio of 3:2 in favor of the psychoneurotic group. That question reads: "Feeling ashamed of myself for having an interest in my body." Since only 16 per cent of the normal group answers this question positively, i.e., symptomatically, and but 24 per cent of the abnormal group, the question at best is not remarkably diagnostic one way or another.

The outstanding fact—not easy to account for adequately—is the inverse relation whereby the 2:1 and the 3:2 ratios all lean toward the normal group so that the psychoneurotic maladjustments mount high in the childhood of the normals, gradually petering out in maturity, while the self-same maladjustments have a low visibility in the childhood of the abnormals but mount high in the period of Maturity.

One may venture several intelligent guesses as to what

this surprising result may mean. The first suggestion for explaining (away) this result is found in the difference of ages between the two groups, affecting, presumably, the vividness and accuracy of recall. The median age of the abnormals is 31½ years, the range of ages being 20 to 42 years. The median age of the normals is 20½ years, the range 16 to 32 years. If recency be considered the most potent determinant of the vividness and, consequently, of the accuracy of recall, obviously the normals are reporting more reliably than the abnormals. To check up this possibility, I have divided the original psychoneurotic groups (two of which have been used in different phases of this experiment, the earlier one consisting of 50 cases, and the more recent one of 70 clinical cases) into two parts as follows:

I. *First Psychoneurotic Group* (No. = 50)

PERIOD OF CHILDHOOD

*Part A:*

(*a*) No. of cases = 18
(*b*) Range of ages from 20 to 30 years
(*c*) No. of questions = 80

Average frequency = 18.777

Symptom Frequency (Summarized)

| *Extreme* | *Moderate* | *Ext. + Mod.* |
|---|---|---|
| 68 | 270 | 338 |

*Part B:*

(*a*) No. of cases = 30
(*b*) Range of ages from 31 to 42 years
(*c*) No. of questions = 80

Average frequency = 17.90

Symptom Frequency (Summarized)

| *Extreme* | *Moderate* | *Ext. + Mod.* |
|---|---|---|
| 161 | 377 | 538 |

II. *Second Psychoneurotic Group* (No. = 70)

PERIOD OF CHILDHOOD

*Part A:*

(*a*) No. of cases = 20
(*b*) Range of ages from 18 to 30 years
(*c*) No. of questions = 30

Average frequency = 8.55

Symptom Frequency (Summarized)

| *Extreme* | *Moderate* | *Ext. + Mod.* |
|---|---|---|
| 46 | 125 | 171 |

*Part B:*

(*a*) No. of cases = 48
(*b*) Range of ages from 31 to 55 years
(*c*) No. of questions = 30

Average frequency = 6.604

Symptom Frequency (Summarized)

| *Extreme* | *Moderate* | *Ext. + Mod.* |
|---|---|---|
| 79 | 238 | 317 |

Though the number of cases used in the several parts of this little experiment is not very impressive statistically, still it is permissible to infer from the data at hand that the greater age of the psychoneurotics as contrasted with the normals is not the central determinant of the surprising result already alluded to, viz., the relative absence of psychoneurotic involvement in the childhood of the abnormals and the considerable presence of psychoneurotic maladjustment in the childhood of the normals. The factor of recency as implying vividness and accuracy of recall is not the key to the explanation of this interesting situation.

Though recency may be an important factor in accuracy of recall, frequency and intensity are no less significant for the persistence of memories: as witness the tenacity of memories rooting in early childhood and preserved even in senility. We might reasonably argue,

then, that being older does not of its own accord militate against the retention and recollection of memories sprung from childhood situations especially when these latter are universally distributed, and in no sense unique occurrences.

Another plausible conjecture is derived from Freudian psychoanalysis, viz., that the typically psychoneurotic individual is precisely the one in whom childhood memories have undergone a censored repression; hence, that nothing short of a deep-probing catharsis or a laborious analysis will avail to dissolve the repressions and to unearth the unconscious memories underlying them. In this conception, the psychoneurotic is such because his life has been wrenched out of focus, distorted, by concealment of perturbing childhood events, more particularly those involving sexual episodes and ego-frustration. The weakness of this thesis for the problem under discussion is the existence (in the Questionnaire on Childhood) of an abundance of material not even remotely related to affairs sexual.

A more impressive speculation involves the play of the factor of motivation. By what may be termed "dramatic antithesis" the psychoneurotic, loaded with maladjustments and pains, real and imaginary, looks back through the distorting medium of his present misery, maximized by self-pity, upon a period when life was simple and he was getting along well enough, so well, by contrast with his current woe, that it seems a golden age, wholly free of pain or bafflement. This "fallacy of motivation" is familiar enough in all psychoneurotic thinking. The past, present, and future are all in unstable flux, being periodically reinterpreted to dovetail with a new shift in motivation. Professor Hollingworth's illuminating study

demonstrates the potency of the rôle of motivation in the symptom-report of the psychoneurotic. If we roughly subdivide motivation into the retrospective and the prospective varieties, and if we decide to call the effect upon psychoneurotic motivation of the *liberation* of the Armistice, "prospective," we may look upon the effect of the *burden* of postbellum reality in relation to motivation as "retrospective." The present is unbearable; the past, especially the remote past, must have been excellent. A kindred duality of motivation is found in racial psychology, in the myths, memories, and folk-lore of peoples.

We might venture another interpretation. A psychoneurotic, by hypothesis, is the person who can carry on fairly well in simple situations, in a rather uniform environment, but slides into maladjustments under pressure of complicated situations, in novel or difficult environments. For reasons intellectual or emotional or both, the psychoneurotic stamps himself clearly as such by his overt failure to hold his own in a milieu more taxing and baffling than his childhood ever encountered. The psychoneurotic, on this surmise, is an overgrown child. He is mature physically and physiologically, but not intellectually or emotionally.

We might hazard the assumption which is built on the Freudian theory that normal and psychoneurotic are psychobiologically alike except for one significant particular, to wit, the capacity for sublimation, i.e., for the transforming of unconscious conflicts (e.g., between the claims of the ego and the demands of the herd) into conscious compromises with social reality. Civilization's insistence upon team work, self-denial, adjustment to complexity of behavior, is too big an order for the so-called psychoneurotic: in his crisis of inadequacy, he falls back upon

evasion, ailment, delusion, self-pity, and reverie. His *flight from reality* measures his incapacity for maturity, for sublimating his primitive, childish ego-impulses, i.e., his infantilism;—in short, his incapacity for normal behavior, under civilization. Though their literal childhood seems to have been, and most likely, in reality was, relatively free from complication, our psychoneurotics are what they are in maturity—the crisis of growing up apparently breaks them—because they are intellectually and emotionally unequal to the adult burdens of life under a repressive and exacting civilization.

Another explanation suggested [2] for the perplexing situation discussed in this section is the simple and plausible one of sheer falsification of report (perhaps "unconsciously") by the "subjects" at the Veterans Hospital whose primary desire was to continue enjoying the compensation which the Government had been allowing them since the War. The more I pondered this explanation the more certain became my conviction that it is untenable. To begin with, the assumption that all these men were keen enough to falsify their childhood situation in order that it might appear relatively innocent and unburdened by maladjustment as compared with their status in maturity, and more particularly since the War, is a rather wide and sweeping one. It must also be borne in mind that the inventory was presented by a psychologist who did not occupy a status which in their opinion would in any wise suggest a relation to their problem of compensation. The auspices under which the "test" was given were purely of a psychological nature. The men knew that the inventory was wholly unrelated

[2] By Dr. Goodwin Watson rather emphatically, and by Dr. George Van Ness Dearborn more tentatively, at the Ph.D. "Oral Examination."

to their medical status as war veterans entitled to a (small) compensation from the Government because of their several-year-old incapacity.

It is the expressed judgment of every experimenter who has made use of the psychoneurotic inventory, whether with children or with adults, that in an atmosphere of confidence and cordiality, under the protective guardianship of anonymity (the "subject" need not affix his name), the responses are given in a spirit of honesty. The significant experience on this delicate point of Woodworth, Mathews, Slawson, House and others cannot be brushed aside as irrelevant.

It is more convincing to assume that the true explanation emerges either from the very specialized effect of the war experience or from educational status. To be sure, the whole problem deserves more study and a careful check-up by other experimenters.

Finally a check [3] on this somewhat baffling situation in childhood was obtained by comparing the results for similar age categories among normals and psychoneurotics. The various groups of normals studied in this research were ten years younger on the average than the psychoneurotics. It was desirable, therefore, to get a group of normals ranging between the ages of 30 and 45 as a basis of adequate comparison with the declared psychoneurotics. The results that follow are an attempt to illuminate the situation from this new angle.

[3] At the suggestion of Professor Woodworth, I finally added this bit of analysis. With the cordial coöperation of Prof. Leta S. Hollingworth, Dr. Goodwin Watson, and Mr. Spence, I secured 30 "subjects" at Teachers College for the purpose of this Study. The median age of this group of Normals is almost identical with that of the Psychoneurotics used in this research.

SYMPTOM FREQUENCY

(N = 30)

| *Age* | *Childhood* | *Maturity* |
|---|---|---|
| 35 | 10 | 34 |
| 31 | 13 | 32 |
| 31 | 8 | 9 |
| 30 | 14 | 35 |
| 38 | 9 | 25 |
| 41 | 17 | 39 |
| 37 | 17 | 42 |
| 39 | 5 | 15 |
| 33 | 9 | 8 |
| 32 | 12 | 34 |
| 37 | 20 | 39 |
| 45 | 11 | 17 |
| 33 | 19 | 40 |
| 34 | 1 | 7 |
| 33 | 17 | 47 |
| 31 | 21 | 57 |
| 39 | 15 | 30 |
| 34 | 5 | 8 |
| 42 | 8 | 34 |
| 31 | 9 | 26 |
| 33 | 9 | 13 |
| 43 | 22 | 61 |
| 40 | 21 | 58 |
| 42 | 16 | 40 |
| 28 | 13 | 25 |
| 28 | 22 | 54 |
| 27 | 13 | 16 |
| 26 | 12 | 14 |
| 26 | 5 | 4 |
| 23 | 11 | 27 |
| Median = Age 33 | Av. Freq. = 12.80 | Av. Freq. = 29.67 |

The inventory used in this experiment contained 30 questions in childhood and 70 questions in maturity. The same inventory was used for the group of 400 normals and of 70 psychoneurotics in Experiment Two of this research.

| Normals (N = 400) | Psychoneurotics (N = 70) |
|---|---|

| | *Combined Av. Frequency* | |
|---|---|---|
| Childhood: | 11.87 | 6.94 |
| Maturity: | 25.09 | 38.13 |

Thus, we observe that a difference in median ages amounting to ten years as between the original group of (400) normals and the final check-up group of (30) normals indicates no significant difference in the average symptom-frequency for childhood or maturity, though our present interest is exclusively in the childhood situation. Age is not the crucial factor. The psychoneurotic ratio runs consistently in favor of the normals in childhood.

We are once more driven to the conclusion that the impressive difference between the childhood situation of the normals and of the psychoneurotics studied in this investigation is traceable to one of two factors. Either scholastic status, or the traumatic episode connected with participation in the War, is definitely accountable for the difference. There is a little evidence in this Study for the former hypothesis: to be sure, the declared psychoneurotics of collegiate status (only a handful being available) [4] reveal a situation in childhood quite comparable to that of the collegiate normals. It must be borne in mind, however, that a psychoneurotic ratio of real discrimination (2:1 and 3:2) does not exist, in any event, in these results. Hence we may reiterate the find-

[4] To check up this point adequately one should have access to a reasonably large group of declared psychoneurotics of collegiate status. They are simply not to be got at! The public clinics are filled with psychoneurotics whose education is painfully limited. Only the private psychiatrists are in touch with the psychoneurotic intelligentsia. And private psychiatrists have a conception of psychoneurotic involvement so flexible and fetching that any person who comes for treatment with any kind of malaise whatsoever is dubbed "psychoneurotic." Besides, the private psychiatrist will not permit a mere psychologist to intrude into his sacred domain.

ing of the several experiments in this study to the effect that the childhood situation of the so-called normals, contrary to theoretic and general psychologic expectation, is surprisingly "psychoneurotic," while the childhood situation of the declared psychoneurotics, contrary to theoretic and general psychiatric expectation, is surprisingly "normal".

The second hypothesis, involving the importance of the traumatic episode of war-participation, is illuminating and has already been discussed at considerable length. The Adlerian theory of "compensation" for felt inferiority is the important key to this plausible explanation.

A speculative theory that has intrigued my mind again and again springs from the not unreasonable analogy between the concept of immunity in relation to germ diseases and the concept of functional reaction to "psychoneurotic" situations. Why is it not permissible to argue that the person who enjoys a reasonable quantum of health, physical or mental, is precisely he who is always a little ill but still proves himself adequate by carrying on nevertheless. For example, the epidemic of influenza that ravaged a large portion of the earth back in 1918 found its most responsive victims precisely among those persons whose record for health and general well-being was remarkable. In talking this strange situation over with a scientific young doctor, I became aware of the interesting nature of immunity to disease as primarily dependent upon a prior series of successful adjustments to illnesses that plagued the body, were resisted, and finally overcome.

In other words, those persons whose bodies have known ailments which have been rather satisfactorily survived, are best equipped to face a real crisis of illness and win

through. By analogy, we may venture the assumption that your so-called normal person proves himself such in maturity when the crises of life are no longer to be dodged, precisely because he has always from earliest childhood confronted maladjustment and yet somehow made his peace with his handicaps. Your typical psychoneurotic breaks badly when the crises of growing-up confront him because his equipment, biologic or psychologic or both, has been infantile and immature, splendid for childhood, inadequate for maturity. His personality has not undergone, from its earliest days, those strains and adjustments as a result of which the organism, speaking psychologically, attains to a certain amount of immunity to psychoneurotic "diseases". Perhaps, this is only another way of saying that he lacks intellect and personality!

A baffling problem in the analysis of the psychoneurotic —assuming the existence of such a "type" or an approximation thereto—is the therapeutic one of reëducation. There appear to be a group of psychoneurotics whose salvation lies in deliberate fleeing from the complications of reality, especially as determined by a mature, civilized environment. Janet has developed a brilliant thesis to demonstrate the wisdom of teaching this type of psychoneurotic that the avoidance of bankruptcy for him lies in the severe cutting down of psychic expenditure. He would definitely urge upon these overburdened and overwrought personalities a simplification of life in the direction of avoidance and evasion of the complexities of reality.

There is another group of psychoneurotics whose essential malaise appears to spring from their failure to grapple with life's problems to the full limit of their

stature as personalities. Jung (and in a more limited sense, Adler) has most intelligently defended this thesis. With this "type" of psychoneurotic, salvation is to be attained not by a deliberate diminution of burdens and responsibilities (the proverbial flight from reality) but rather by a deliberate expansion of aims and loyalties and obligations. If we accept Jung's keen assumption, we are the better prepared to understand those maladjusted persons who are continually suffering from an inadequate expenditure of energy, from ego-frustration.

Applying these interesting speculations to our own findings, we may venture the guess that the incorrigible war psychoneurotics are the Janet type whose balance sheet, psychiatrically, is all askew because income and expenditure are not properly equated. If they were helped to shift over into a more simple and less onerous environment, where the obligations of civilized maturity were reduced to a minimum bordering on an almost infantile level, they would, most likely, "normalize." They are so wretchedly psychoneurotic because "society" calls upon them for a psychic expenditure of which they are, by endowment and environmental possibility, simply incapable. Of course, a sufficient amount of education (assuming their capacity for absorbing it) might have given many of these psychoneurotics the kinds of habits which go a long way toward salvaging personality.

One may reasonably conjecture that among our educated normals whose inventories reveal psychoneurotic status there must be many who belong to Jung's category; intelligent persons who are loaded with frustration and maladjustment because they have not found their "place" in life, whose real predicament lies in dodging or misconceiving their true burden of personality-fulfill-

ment. Their environment is not in need of greater simplification but rather of an increasing complication.

Another point meriting further study is the very important relation between attention and tension. This interrelation seems often to be the very key to *functional* difficulties. We may plausibly assume in all functional situations a certain amount of organic involvement which is too subtle and complex to be traceable or measurable by our present methods of gross analysis and definition. The point is that psychoneurotic involvement appears to be, quintessentially, the resultant of *excessive* attention (and hence, excess tension) to a part-situation.[5]

As we survey the situation *in maturity* among our normals and psychoneurotics, we discover that the symtom-frequencies for both groups are quite comparable as regards the "moderate" category. The true point of differentiation lies in the "extreme" category: the declared psychoneurotics reveal themselves as such in the extreme manifestations of their maladjustments, the ratio of discrimination (from the normals) clearly setting them off as such.

In applying the attention-tension hypothesis, may we not assume that the declared psychoneurotics, more particularly the war cases, are so burdened by present maladjustment in quite extreme form that they must perforce give an excessive attention to their current woes, thus leaving them no available energy-of-attention for other situations such as those in childhood? In short,

[5] This notion is in line with Hollingworth's "mechanism of redintegration" as explanatory of the typical psychoneurotic's total response to a detail of a remembered experience. He proves himself psychoneurotic precisely because he gives an excessive attention (hence, excess tension) to a fragment of experience, implicating his organism or his environment or both. . . . This attention-hypothesis may also be linked up with Kempf's conception of "segmental" cravings and strivings.

their mental situation is one of considerable rigidity and fixation, what Janet calls a narrowing of the field of consciousness. Our normals, on the other hand, just because their present situation does not invite an excessive attention to current maladjustment are able to devote a flexible "consciousness" to many attention-situations including those belonging to childhood.

The point simply is this: there appears to be a most significant interrelation between attention and tension. This fact, if it be such, may provide a key to functional difficulties from a purely psychological angle. The typical psychoneurotic suffers from habits of excessive attention to part-situations: hence the excess tension underlying his behavior. The typical normal suffers from no such obsessive habits. *Normality may thus be conceived as flexibility of attention. Psychoneurotics, by and large, lack the capacity for this flexibility of attention.*

The interesting fact to bear in mind is that the childhood of the declared psychoneurotics is relatively normal: while the childhood of the apparent normals is relatively psychoneurotic.[6] The psychoneurotic reveals himself definitely such in Maturity, by manifesting a characteristically abnormal frequency of symptoms; the normal proves himself clearly such by outgrowing his childhood tendency to psychoneurotic maladjustment, i.e., by "holding his own" in maturity.

In fine, the psychoneurotic is the overgrown child; the normal is the grown-up child. A significant difference in

[6] A bit of reaffirming evidence has just come to my notice in a Study by Dr. Lloyd H. Ziegler, in *Mental Hygiene*, 1925, entitled "A Group of Psychoneurotic Ex-Service Men." In his Summary, he notes: "About half (i.e., 82) showed none of the so-called neurotic traits of childhood."

behavior, whether viewed psychologically or psychiatrically!

Briefly, we may pass in review the various assumptions which have been considered in the attempt to account for the perplexing problem of the childhood of the psychoneurotics, a problem raised for the first time in this study.

1. Age, involving the problem of accuracy in recall.
2. The Freudian theory of repression.
3. The rôle of motivation.
4. Infantilism.
5. Sublimation.
6. Sheer falsification of report.
7. Scholastic status.
8. Traumatic episode.
9. Adlerian compensation.
10. The hypothesis of immunity.
11. The Janet type of psychoneurotic.
12. The attention-tension hypothesis.

In the field of the psychoneuroses, no one explanation is ever wholly adequate. The psychological situation is so complex that the one error it is most important to avoid is oversimplification. We may definitely rule out factors 1, 2, 5, and 6, as untenable. Factors 3, 8, 9, and 11, all interrelate and mean very much the same thing, namely, that these men are suffering from *personality-deficit* and are compensating for a felt inadequacy by flight from reality. Factors 4 and 11 belong together and are a legitimate supplement to the factors just enumerated under the assumption of "inadequacy." Factor 12 stands rather alone, a significant speculation deserving more study. Finally, we confront factor 7 concerning scholastic status. It would have been enormously clarifying had this determinant been properly checked up. The "subjects" were, unfortunately, not available in sufficiently large numbers.

Educationally, the alternatives shedding light are two. We may bank on the conventional assumption that scholastic training "disciplines the mind," as, for instance, in the development of powers of keen discrimination. Our collegiate normals, acutely aware of every bit of evidence of maladjustment, stack up a lot of "symptoms" for childhood, while our less educated psychoneurotics, not so keen in powers of perception, and in the refined analysis of experience, report comparatively little for that same period. The statistical findings show average frequencies from 50 to 100 per cent greater for the normals than for the psychoneurotics in the *"moderate"* symptom-responses. In "extreme" responses, the normals show but slightly higher frequencies.

The other alternative assumes problems of maladjustment in childhood to arise from the conflict between personal status and scholastic ideal, the latter being determined by parental and familial authority. The adult goals set for the struggling youngster in an educated family impose aspirations, ideals, ambitions, conceits and pretenses that come into sharp clash with actual performance. Fears and worries over scholastic status are numerous and real. To live up to parental and familial expectation is the great goal of the youngling's life. Fear of failure registers itself in lack of self-confidence and in a sense of inferiority. This intense conflict in Childhood is rendered visible in behavior that is clearly psychoneurotic in character. The statistical evidence for this hypothesis is quite illuminating. In Experiments One and Two, the frequencies for the Normals and for the Psychoneurotics in relation to those very problems which touch most closely the heart of the situation we have been discussing, are as follows:

EXPERIMENT ONE[7]

CHILDHOOD

| Question | Problem | Frequencies: Normal (N = 140) | Frequencies: Psychoneurotic (N = 50) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | Unfair treatment by teachers | 27% | 14% |
| 11. | Desire to run away from home | 21 | 16 |
| 14. | A "mental" shock | 14 | 10 |
| 15. | Fidgeting | 43 | 26 |
| 20. | Mind-wandering | 33 | 16 |
| 25. | Biting fingernails | 50 | 28 |
| 30. | Shyness | 78 | 68 |
| 35. | Swift change of interests | 49 | 28 |
| 51. | Being moody | 50 | 34 |
| 52. | Wanting to get even with someone | 62 | 40 |
| 53. | "Tantrums" | 36 | 28 |
| 54. | Daydreaming in the midst of studies | 71 | 40 |
| 57. | Sense of inferiority | 49 | 34 |
| 58. | Lack of self-confidence | 51 | 38 |
| 63. | Considering myself a nervous person | 22 | 14 |
| 67. | Depressed because of low marks | 38 | 26 |
| 77. | Periods of unhappiness | 34 | 28 |
| 79. | Preferring to play alone | 34 | 12 |

[7] See Inventory, Exhibit B.

EXPERIMENT TWO[8]

| Question | Problem | Frequencies: Normal (N = 400) | Frequencies: Psychoneurotic (N = 70) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | Unfair treatment by teachers | 37% | 21% |
| 12. | Wanting to get even with someone | 62 | 31 |
| 13. | Sense of inferiority | 57 | 30 |
| 14. | Depressed because of low marks | 41 | 27 |
| 15. | Preferring to play alone | 36 | 21 |
| 16. | Mind-wandering | 47 | 18 |
| 20. | Swift change of interests | 54 | 34 |
| 21. | Being moody | 53 | 34 |
| 22. | Daydreaming in the midst of studies | 77 | 45 |
| 23. | Considering myself a nervous person | 29 | 17 |
| 24. | "Tantrums" | 39 | 24 |
| 27. | Fidgeting | 40 | 31 |
| 28. | Biting fingernails | 35 | 27 |
| 30. | Shyness | 74 | 53 |

[8] See Inventory, Exhibit C.

The normals carry greater burdens in childhood than do the psychoneurotics because, one might say, their goals are more mature. Our psychoneurotics have no such ambitions and obligations held up before them as ideals to be realized at all costs; their social status is humble, their educational interest meager. A simple physical life, a minimum of interest in intellectual prestige, no preoccupation with "getting there"; hence, the ease of adjustment to their environment. They are not constantly subjected to the neurotic conflict accompanying the contradiction between aims (ideals set by their elders) and accomplishments. Our "psychoneurotic" gets along reasonably well in a childish environment. Our "normal" is constantly urged to transcend it, to hurry on to maturity. The former is complacent and happy—in childhood. The latter is goaded by social and educational ideals to aspire, to achieve, to become mature. His childhood is weighted with tension, keyed up, neurotic. His load of obligation is heavier—to the ideals and pretenses of his educators.

In this explanation educational status is conceived of not only as determined by native capacity but also by social pressure.

## Chapter XI

# THE NEW EDUCATIONAL PSYCHIATRY

Doctor Alfred Adler's psychology (which we in America mistakenly call "psychoanalysis") is the most important contribution to *dynamic* behaviorism made in our generation.

Steering clear of the grotesquely fantastic speculations that disfigure the Freudian psychoanalysis, conceiving his work to be that of an educational psychologist, Doctor Adler has constructed a bridge of accommodation between psychiatry and psychology that has brought the two vital disciplines into a deeper harmony of interest and outlook.

"Individual Psychology" has burrowed its way deeply into academic and clinical psychology. No significant study, undertaken in our institutions of learning, and at our clinics, as regards the period of childhood more particularly, but reveals the enormous import of feelings of inferiority with their accompanying "mechanisms of compensation."

In sober truth, "compensatory" behavior is the most widely ramifying fact associated with human conduct and misconduct.

Whatever is vital in Freudian psychoanalysis—such as the incessant striving of the "libido" toward satisfying expression and fulfillment—is correlated with the underlying reality of "feelings of inferiority": i.e., the *inade-*

*quacy of the ego,* from which spring wishes and desirings and sublimations.

The obsessive interest in sex generated by our cabaret civilization, with its drastic subordination of procreation to recreation as the ideal of sex life, and rationalized into dramatic doctrines and dogmas by the Freudians, has tended to obscure the more sober, but none the less equally momentous, insight of Doctor Adler, viz., that if there be any basic fact in human behavior and experience, it is the universal fact of "inferiority" arising inevitably in childhood, the period of helplessness.

Childhood, the period of feebleness, lives by fear: fear of authority: fear of parents, older brothers and sisters, teachers, priests, policemen (society!), Nature. Why wonder at the vast influence of feelings of inferiority in childhood?

Shyness, desire to "get even," lack of self-confidence, fears of this and that, day-dreaming (as "compensatory"), shames associated with natural behavior experienced or observed,—what are they all but manifestations of immaturity in personality-development, "neurotic" evidences of personality deficit, in a world dominated (not by children!) by adults, by authoritarian grown-ups?

In adolescence, sex emerges as an invasive reality in the life of youth, knocking at the gates of consciousness, seeking objectification in reverie, play, coquetry, shy (and sometimes brazen) tentatives toward sexual intercourse.

The residuals of childhood inferiority continue to play their important rôle in this process of growth and "self-realization," complicated by sexual desire and moral restraint.

What is most in evidence in the process of "growing-up" is the supersession of fear by anxiety; the increasing bafflements wrought by the unsolved problems of childhood and adolescence; the tensions and confusions and emotional conflicts that usher in and characterize maturity. Anxiety, the half-way house between fear and frustration, hints at the maladjustment between human nature and cultural environment.

The emergence of personality is symbolized by the presence of disharmony that makes the youth aware of the gulf between desire and fulfillment, of the conflict between the ego and the herd, of the discrepancy between ideal and reality. The center of gravity in maturity is the emerging personality.

Personality-deficit is the symbol for those maladjustments of human nature *in its crises* of growing-up, to which dynamic psychology and psychiatry devote an increasing attention.

A vast field of research is thus opened out to educators (including the humble schoolteachers) to discover by what behaviors and misbehaviors the emerging personality of the child is attempting—blindly, gropingly, evasively, autistically, "unconsciously"—to work out compensations for its inadequacies, in other words, to achieve *adequacy.*

Whether viewed sociologically or psychologically, the central problem is that of the attainment of adequacy.

A conception that fits in beautifully with the analytic insights of all the "Schools" and is in harmony with the assumptions of the Mental Hygiene Movement is what I have termed *personality deficit.*

The psychoanalysts, for all their vital concern with personality, have cut up the "organismic whole" into

fragments, with characteristic labels and descriptions, and thus, unwittingly, reverted to a kind of "faculty" psychologizing which is in essence static rather than dynamic.

Thus Freud offers us fixed and immutable solutions of problems of sexual discord which can only be approached, scientifically, by a specific analysis of specific situations, not by wholesale *à priori* assumptions concerning human nature in general.

The wholesale method of analysis leads inevitably to stereotyped formulæ, rote and ritual, doctrine and dogma, inspiration and intuition: magic and metaphysic.

If this criticism appear too harsh and unwarranted, we need but recall Freud's recent works with the bizarre caption of *Metapsychology!* Freudian psychoanalysis, grounded in some remarkable insights, is inextricably interwoven with magic and metaphysics.

The Adlerian psychology, in revolting against Freudianism, has rejected rote and ritual, metaphysic and magic, and created a simplified and enormously sane "psychoanalysis," allied with education and devoted to a concrete study of specific maladjustments, *especially in childhood,* admittedly the period when neurotic eccentricity and personality deficit make themselves most vividly manifest.

The socio-psychologic counterpart to Adler's psychopathologic conception of "inferiority" is my conception of "personality-deficit."

Thus we can link into one organismic whole all the dynamic psychologies and all the social sciences. The bond of harmony is their humanistic concern with personality as a study in the attainment of adequacy.

The American reader will be pleased to learn that

Doctor Adler's philosophic outlook is of a piece with John Dewey's: constant reference to the *social* factor in thinking and doing, in behavior and experience.

Adler, like Dewey, is primarily an educator, a believer in human educability, an advocate of socialized democracy, a remarkably human teacher, a physician of the soul!

If we consult the more recent works in sociology, economics, academic psychology, psychoanalysis, psychiatry, education, literature, we discover that the Adlerian conceptions of neurotic behavior, feelings of inferiority, mechanisms of compensation, achieve increasingly their rightful status as profound contributions to the clarification of human nature.

Since the mind is addicted to the search for fundamental unifying concepts (in its effort to gather up into a luminous focus the ramifying aspects of reality), we may venture upon the assumption that the underlying basis of psychoneurotic maladjustment is *personality-deficit*. Another way of putting it is to speak of "organismic" inadequacy. Some years ago, in a learned historical survey of social processes,[1] Prof. Giddings dwelt upon the concept of adequacy as the one best suited to a clarification of what life strives to attain in its trial-and-error experimentations. "Without explicitly telling us so, the founders of sociology have in fact, it would seem, without exception, conceived of the science of society as a systematic study of the increase and distribution of human adequacy to exist and achieve. . . . Society is made to the end that it may produce human adequacy, and above

[1] Studies in the Theory of Human Society.

all, increase the ratio of adequate individuals to the inadequate." [2]

At long last we have learned that adequacy is not exclusively, nor even dominantly, a correlative of intellectual capacity, since superior brains may be vitiated by inferior emotional equipment. Our latter-day wisdom stresses emotional adequacy as the *sine qua non* of sanity. In my concept of "personality deficit" we take cognizance of both the high positive correlation that may exist between psychoneurotic status and intellectual deficiency,[3] as well as the even higher correlation that may exist between psychoneurotic "make-up" and intellectual adequacy in those cases where emotional maladjustment wars on personality. In short, hysteria, anxiety neurosis, neurasthenia, psychasthenia (picturesque labels that must not be taken too seriously) are compatible with, and may accompany all levels of intellectual competence, with the possible exception of the idiot level.[4] The problem that confronts us as dynamic psychologists is the recognition of the sub-intellectual and subconscious factors-and-forces in human motivation, utilized (sometimes with incredible cunning) in the struggle of the personality toward adequacy.[5] From a mental hygiene point of view, the central problem, as I see it, is one of *personality deficit.*

A word about psychotic tendencies among psychoneurotics. To that orthodox sect of psychoanalysts who feel quite certain that they have hit upon the one and

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 292, 293.

[3] Emphasized by Hollingworth as a psychologist's correction of the psychiatrist's indifference to the intellectual factor in psychoneuroses.

[4] Not including, however, the (misnamed) "idiot-savant."

[5] This conception also fits in well with Dr. Alfred Adler's psychology of inferiority and the mechanism of compensation.

only correct definition of psychoneurosis, it will come as a distinct surprise to discover the considerable amount of definitely psychotic material among the declared psychoneurotics. On the other hand, to those psychiatrists and psychologists who envisage human behavior in terms of a series of flexibly graded responses (as exemplified in the "normal curve of distribution"), the intermingling of every kind of response, normal and psychoneurotic and psychotic, will be perfectly understandable as representing the truly adequate picture of a psychoneurotic. Let an expert be our enlightening spokesman: "The experience of the war showed that there were episodes in apparently normal soldiers which took on many of the characteristics which are common in the psychoses of civilian life. . . . Certain groups of the psychoses are seen as episode reactions, closely related in origin and mechanism to the neuroses, but implying a more profound disturbance of consciousness. They tend to disappear or to undergo favorable modification as the need for them disappears." [6]

An even more convincing judgment is that of the wisest of psychiatrists, Macfie Campbell who says, "The physician dealing with nervous and mental patients is hampered by the cruel tradition that makes an absolute separation between certain groups of patients. We 'admit' patients to 'hospitals'; why, then, do we talk of 'confining' other patients in 'institutions'? It will take some time before the community feels towards all sick people in the same way, realizes that the mentally sick are not absolutely different from the ordinary run of

[6] From "Influence of War Upon Concepts of Mental Diseases and Neuroses," by Doctor Sidney I. Schwab, in *Mental Hygiene*, 1920, pp. 666, 667, 668.

humanity. Just as the term insanity has a rather paralyzing influence on our thought and blinds us to the fact that there is no abrupt transition from the modes of thought of the sane to those of the insane, so the word delinquency is apt to have the same paralyzing effect." [7]

We are coming to understand that behavior symptoms are the raw material of personality-deficit alike among so-called normals and among labeled psychoneurotics. How to achieve adequacy: that's the question! For dynamic psychologists of all varieties.

It is perhaps not wholly irrelevant to quote a keen psychiatrist, Eugene Bleuler, who writes: "At this time, one of the most important, if not the most important, of all paths to a knowledge of the human soul is by way of psychopathology.[8]

The concrete complexity of the problems that conjointly constitute the so-called psychoneurotic types makes it increasingly evident to psychiatrists and psychologists that the great need is for more detailed attention to *specific maladjustments* and a correspondingly diminishing respect for classic labels and fixed categories.

As Dr. Franz reminds us: "Psychology is, however, becoming more and more dynamic, even in the psychiatric sense. . . . Because in both psychology and psychiatry a knowledge of abnormalities and of pathological conditions is of value, more and more investigations must be made if advances are to be expected. They will serve to benefit both psychology and psychiatry." [9]

[7] From "The Minimum of Medical Insight Required by Social Workers with Delinquents," in *Mental Hygiene,* 1920, July-October, pp. 518, 519.

[8] Professor McDougall (who quotes this) says: "This dictum of a great psychiatrist seems to me indisputable."

[9] Quoted from "Psychology and Psychiatry," by Dr. Shepherd Ivory Franz, in *The Psychologic Review,* 1922, pp. 248, 249.

Only a diminishing band of indoor academicals will want to deny the wisdom of these reflections on the evolution of psychology toward psychopathology.

Abnormal psychology becomes increasingly normal!

Doctor Adler has the unique distinction of having purified psychoanalysis of its extravagance and grotesquerie, of having linked his educational psychology with social philosophy, and best of all, of having dedicated himself throughout his most fruitful years, as teacher of teachers, to the study of "problem children" in their most realistic environments, the school and the home.

No greater service than this has been rendered to contemporary enlightenment by any psychologist or educator.

Doctor Adler is the pioneer in the still virginal field of *educational psychiatry.*

The most ironic comment on the older static psychology is that it was a psychology without human nature. When we speak of the newer dynamic psychology we mean to draw attention to the perplexities, disharmonies, and maladjustments that collectively constitute a human nature *in reality.*

We may distinguish five stages in the evolution of psychology: the metaphysical, the mathematical, the physiological, the psycho-physiological, and the psychological proper. The great names representative of these approaches would include Aristotle, Fechner, Helmholtz, Wundt, Freud. The emphasis, until the ascendancy of psychoanalysis, was almost wholly upon organs and specific reactions and precise laboratory technique. The revolution in the content and method and aim of psychology that the Freudians ushered in stressed not organs but organisms and personalities, not specific sensory reac-

tions but rather general and human emotional reactions, not mathematically precise quantitative technic but what we may call a clinically valid qualitative technic.

Human nature in its complexity and perplexity became the vital subject matter of psychological exploration under conditions that promised a maximum amount of clinical contact and observation of the personality as a whole in a state of tension and stress and inner conflict. Psychology became for the first time in its history genuinely dynamic and humanistic.

It is worth lingering a moment to survey the deep differences between the assumptions of the older and the newer psychology. If we agree to characterize the former as essentially static and the latter as quintessentially dynamic, we can understand the more readily how sharp the antitheses between their basic preconceptions. Perhaps the presentation of these differences in a parallel will make the matter fairly clear:

| *Assumptions of static psychology* | *Assumptions of dynamic psychology* |
|---|---|
| rationality | irrationality |
| normality | abnormality |
| consciousness | subconsciousness |
| organs | organisms, personalities |
| science = facts | science = values |
| laboratory = research center | life = research center |
| adult reactions most important | infantile reactions most important |
| method: quantitative perfection | method: qualitative generalization |
| social forces neglected | social forces appreciated |
| utility lightly regarded | utility highly regarded |
| association: primary fact | dissociation: fundamental datum |

Two facts stand out with a marvelous clarity: the shift of the center of gravity from the academic laboratory to the psychiatric clinic and the substitution of the dynamic concept of personality, of organism, for the static concept of fragments-of-personality, of organs, as the significant subject matter of psychological study. Strangely enough, psychology concerns itself almost exclusively now with human nature.

It is no end amusing to realize that the most brilliant contribution to psychology has come from a man and a method that brushed aside with an almost vandalistic contempt the lovely instruments of precision which indoor psychologizing, proudly fashioning itself upon physics as a virginal model, had been modestly perfecting for a generation or more. Freud, trusting to imagination and insight and personal wisdom, ignored as if they were of no account both the mathematical and the physiological approaches to the problems of psychology.

A quaint paradox had arisen to baffle the minds of the dynamic psychologists, academic and clinical. Medicine had built its theories and practices wholly upon organic assumptions concerning human nature in health and disease. The subtlest achievement of organic medicine, viz., neurology, had reached a state of perfection so minute as to render it the most admirable and the most useless of sciences. Therapeutically, organic neurology hadn't the remotest conception of the disharmonies and perturbing conflicts that rocked human beings to their psychoneurotic and psychotic depths. Evidently, the organic approach to human nature as a study in the disharmonies of personality was very limited indeed. Hence, the creative audacity of that small group of dynamic psychiatrists who reconceived medicine in terms drastically psy-

chologic and functional. The emergence of the psychoanalytic technic put an end once for all to the vain boasts of the organicists that "materia medica" is sufficient unto itself and can dispense with psychological insight. The war provided the perfect demonstration of the failure of organic neurology and the astonishing triumph of psychoanalytic psychology in understanding and solving the problems of neurotic breakdown ("shell-shock").

Thus medicine which had leaned so long upon physiology achieved its most brilliant triumph by becoming unequivocally psychological. But psychology, which had intertwined itself since its metaphysical beginning with mentalistic and relatively intangible assumptions, suddenly decided to become nobly scientific by wooing physiology most shamelessly. Enter behaviorism, trailing clouds of scientific glory, exuberantly affirming its physiologic and most materialistic basis, and as raucously repudiating the purely psychological assumptions of the traditionally accredited "science of the soul".

A pretty state of things, forsooth: Behaviorism modestly assuring us that psychology as a real science was born in 1913 in the brain (behaviorists are not burdened with a mind) of Dr. Watson when he definitely decided that the most perfect model for an adequate comprehension of human behavior was the laboratory study of the white rat, the *only* difference between man and other animals being language, all other differences and discrepancies in nature being generously canceled out of existence by the overwhelming necessity of finally putting psychology on a basis as reputably scientific as that of physics. Bravo, Watson! the behavioristic bull in the introspectionist china shop. But lo! a mystery. Watson

had failed to note that there were two varieties of introspection, one academic and absurd and sterile, against the authority of which he rebelled most persuasively (in laughing out of court Messrs. Titchener, Angell, Bentley, et al.), the other clinical and profound and fruitful, which he had thought highly of until he found shrewd reason for boosting the stocks of behaviorism by a competitor's assault upon a flourishing psychoanalysis.

Psychology, traditionally mentalistic, seeking to rid itself of the asphyxiating burden of a self-enclosed, utterly vapid and unmeaning introspectionalism, crudely repudiating mind and consciousness and personality and idea and thinking, blindly ignoring a more fruitful and humanistic kind of introspection (self-analysis), seeking reputable status as a true science; while, on the other hand, medicine, traditionally materialistic and physiological, caught in a desperate impasse of descriptive accuracy and therapeutic futility, bravely breaking the bondage of old-fashioned scientific technic and enthusiastically creating the new medicine on the incredible basis of purely psychological concepts! And so matters stand at the present. Two vital psychologies obsess the contemporary mind: psychoanalysis and behaviorism.

## Chapter XII

# THE PSYCHONEUROTIC SITUATION IN OUR COLLEGES

### PERSONAL FOLLOW-UP CONFERENCES
### (*At Harvard*) [1]

On the basis of the 76 inventories originally given to four groups of students in psychology, 20 were selected for follow-up conferences. Inasmuch as time would not permit extensive discussion, it became necessary to limit the interview to problems affecting the period of 'Maturity' almost exclusively. The following table summarizes the frequencies for the 76 cases, for maturity only:

*Frequency Distribution*
(N = 76)

| *Range* | *Total No.* |
|---|---|
| 0– 5 | 1 |
| 5–10 | 11 |
| 10–15 | 12 |
| 15–20 | 9 |
| 20–25 | 19 |
| 25–30 | 9 |
| 30–35 | 4 |
| 35–40 | 7 |
| 40–45 | 1 |
| 45–50 | 3 |
| | Total = 76 |

[1] Having been invited (Sept. 1926) to be one of Dr. Morton Prince's assistants in his new course in Abnormal Psychology at Harvard, I took the opportunity, with the cordial coöperation of Prof. Boring and his associate, Mr. Pattie, to conduct a series of Conferences with a group of students in psychology.

*Selection for Follow-Up Conferences*

| *Range* | *No. Cases* |
|---|---|
| 0– 5 | 1 |
| 5–10 | 3 |
| 10–15 | 3 |
| 15–20 | 2 |
| 20–25 | 4 |
| 25–30 | 2 |
| 30–35 | 1 |
| 35–40 | 2 |
| 40–45 | 1 |
| 45–50 | 1 |
| | Total = 20 |

The conferences were conducted with a maximum amount of informality without, however, allowing them to degenerate into 'loose talk'. Each student among those selected for the personal interviews was invited to give at least one hour to the conference and, where the problem and the student's desire warranted it, to devote two periods to these "pre-psychiatric analyses". At the opening of the conference the student was invited to talk 'spontaneously' about any problem or problems on his mind at the moment; then the procedure became a little more formal and organized following, but not in rigid routine fashion, an outline consisting of twelve topics for brief discussion. The attempt was made, though with far from perfect success, to keep the interviewer in the obscure background and to allow the discussion to be shaped and controlled by the 'subject' himself; in general, the student was encouraged to 'open up' and talk about these various problems frankly and fully. The appended Conferences eloquently indicate that he usually did so.

It was Prof. Woodworth's idea that one check-up on

the practical utility of the newly devised Inventory could be obtained by a series of Personal Conferences composed, to be sure, of a representative sample of the entire group of those originally inventoried. The point was to see whether the students were 'acting the same rôles', so to speak, in both situations or whether they were shifting 'mental sets'; one type of report being obviously different in significant particulars from the other. The results of this follow-up experiment appear to be remarkably in favor of the assumption that the 'Mental Hygiene Inventory' is dependable as an instrument of personal inquiry and report.[2]

The reports on the conferences as herewith presented follow an order which runs from highest to lowest symptom-frequency as discoverable in the original inventory:

| *Inventory No.* (*Maturity*) | *Symptom Freq.* |
|---|---|
| 70 | 49 |
| 43 | 47 |
| 4 | 39 |
| 20 | 36 |
| 42 | 32 |
| 69 | 30 |
| 1 | 28 |
| 6 | 28 |
| 32 | 27 |
| 40 | 25 |
| 71 | 23 |
| 2 | 23 |
| 76 | 21 |
| 9 | 19 |
| 63 | 19 |
| 25 | 19 |
| 35 | 8 |
| 57 | 8 |
| 7 | 6 |

[2] Not to mention the evidence of the reliability coefficients.

It is interesting to note in the results of these interviews a reaffirmation of the current psychiatric proposition, to wit, that persons reporting themselves physically well may be quite 'sick' mentally. So far as nineteen representative cases can indicate anything at all, it is rather impressive to observe the overwhelming predominance in the various 'psychoneurotic' situations (among these young collegians) of two problems: (1) Inferiority, (2) Sex. The prize for psychiatric insight must be divided between Adler and Freud. This prevalence of the problems of inferiority and sex maladjustment is evident in the accompanying summary:

| *Inventory No.* | *Major Problem* |
|---|---|
| 70 | Sex |
| 43 | Sex |
| 4 | Shyness |
| 20 | Sex; Inferiority |
| 42 | Mild Inferiority |
| 69 | Sex; Inferiority |
| 1 | Sex |
| 6 | "Shut-in" Personality |
| 32 | Inferiority |
| 40 | "Shut-in" Personality |
| 71 | Mild Inferiority |
| 2 | Inferiority |
| 76 | Mild Inferiority |
| 9 | Sex |
| 63 | Sex; Inferiority |
| 25 | Mild Inferiority |
| 35 | Inferiority |
| 57 | Mild Inferiority |
| 7 | Mild Inferiority |

It must be borne in mind that the problems for discussion and personal report in the conferences were limited to twelve, viz.,

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Poor Health | 5. Sex | 9. Painful Memories |
| 2. Fears | 6. Moods | 10. Inferiority |
| 3. Shyness | 7. Worry | 11. Nervousness |
| 4. Ambitions | 8. Shame | 12. Humor ("Kidding") |

If we revise the list of 'major problems' so as to bunch them under their appropriate categories, we get this picture:

| *Inventory No.* | *Major Problem* |
|---|---|
| 70 | Sex |
| 43 | Sex |
| 1 | Sex |
| 9 | Sex |
| 20 | Sex; Inferiority |
| 69 | Sex; Inferiority |
| 63 | Sex; Inferiority |
| 32 | Inferiority |
| 2 | Inferiority |
| 35 | Inferiority |
| 42 | Mild Inferiority |
| 71 | Mild Inferiority |
| 76 | Mild Inferiority |
| 25 | Mild Inferiority |
| 57 | Mild Inferiority |
| 7 | Mild Inferiority |
| 4 | Shyness |
| 6 | "Shut-in" Personality |
| 40 | "Shut-in" Personality |

Total No. of Cases = 19 [3]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Major Problem: | Sex | 4 |
| | Sex and Inferiority | 3 |
| | Inferiority | 9 |
| | Shyness | 1 |
| | "Shut-in" Personality | 2 |
| | | 19 |

[3] 20 students were scheduled; 1 failed to appear.

Though the number of students interviewed is fairly small, the variety of psychiatric material disclosed by the conferences is truly astonishing at least from the point of view of those who have permitted their minds to create a rather wide gulf between psychology and psychiatry. For example, we are treated to the spectacle of a group of young collegians, quite satisfactory from the point of view of intelligence tests and of physical qualifications, revealing in intimate study the troubling presence of problems of maladjustment including infantile sexuality, traumatic shock, feelings of inferiority, difficult familial situations, parental fixations, the miscarriage of ambition, imperfect social adaptation, adolescent sexual conflicts centering about auto-erotism, even the rather extreme pathology of homosexuality. The psychoneurotic situation confronts us on all sides.

### THE PERSONAL FOLLOW-UP CONFERENCES

#### *Inventory No. 70—First Conference*

I. General Remarks by the "Subject". ("Subject" preferred to go right on with the specific topics of the interview.)

II. Specific Questions addressed to the "Subject" and answers.

A. *Health:* Fair. He had pneumonia, as a result of which he lost weight and became despondent. But as he recovered his weight and health, he says that his "personality changed": he became more "optimistic."

B. *Fears:* He stresses his fear of personal injury which he characterizes as "instinctive". He has to think it over before he is aware that there is

no ground for fear. He instances football as evoking this swift spontaneous fear, though he cannot account for its existence. His fear has not prevented him from participating in athletics.

He recalls the incident at age 12 when, for fifteen minutes or so, he was locked in a trunk. He was not worried over the incident, however.

Another fear involved the feeling that everyone was going to dominate him.

Up to age 12 he was afraid of lightning. . . . More recently his fear concerns his self-consciousness lest he make a fool of himself with people. He says that he shrinks in his father's presence because of the latter's superiority. This feeling is not so intense now.

C. *Shyness:* He refers to himself as always shy. In the last year he has been getting over it. He thinks that one root of his shyness lies in the fact that he has been "around with people older than himself", as at school.

D. *Ambitions:* Yes, he desires to write in order to be of some use to the world. He does not think himself aimless.

E. *Girls and Sex:* He states that he mingles more easily with girls and that he positively dislikes boys more than girls because of his aversion to vulgarity and cheapness which he thinks are more prevalent among boys.

He refers casually to his several love affairs and to his own nature as serious and "not cynical." He asserts that girls affect his moods and that he is always classifying women as superior

and inferior. He seeks an "ideal marriage . . . a woman whom everyone will respect." He takes advice from a sister three years older.

At age 3 or 4, in the mill town where he lived, he got his first knowledge of sex which he calls "vulgar." He witnessed sex behavior among boys and girls in that town whose ages ran up to 12. He acknowledges that his present attitude toward sex, which contains an element of disgust, is undoubtedly of infantile origin. He talks with some girls about sex, but "not with the ideal ones."

*Inventory No. 70—Second Conference*

E. *Girls and Sex* (continued):

(A discussion of passion and sex): The 'Subject' divides women into two classes, the good and the bad. He says that he has "private thoughts on the subject." Referring to the problem of masturbation which seriously concerns him, he gives it as his opinion that "prostitution is less harmful to the body than masturbation, physically. . . Prostitution seems more natural. . . Masturbation seems weak. . . Prostitution is a sort of substitution for marriage."

He is interested in girls. He says that 'petting parties' are fun and are not harmful sexually "if they are not overdone." He adds that "fine girls participate."

F. *Moods:* He reports himself as very moody, always; at any rate, for the past eight years. He is especially moody when certain physical con-

ditions are present, such as when he is hungry or tired out. He acknowledges that his sex problem is also a factor.

Reverting again to his shyness, he mentions his embarrassment in class, fearing that he might be laughed at. He thinks that his "vivid imagination" may have something to do with his sense of shyness. He reports that he has been the butt of various people. For example, he remembers that at age 6 or 7 a fellow ridiculed him. He also finds that his room-mates will laugh at him. He hates one fellow very intensely for it. . . . He is self-conscious in classes, especially in his advanced classes "because of his different ideas."

G. *Worry, Doubt, Conscience:* He is worried over the question of his ability to accomplish his ambitions. He refers to himself as lazy, as not being interested in the details of a subject, but only in general questions. He wants to study some more, to pursue social science and philosophy.

He is worried over his problem of sexual passion which he speaks of as "very intense". He finds passion "disgusting". He tries to curb and control it.

H. *Shame:* (No report).

I. *Memories:* Not painful. He admits to a feeling of inferiority which is "variable".

J. *Inferiority:* In his Freshman year, because of poor work, he was expelled from college. He is quite certain that he took the whole matter as a joke and that no trace of inferiority is linked with that event. Now he says he is doing well at college; he wants to study more and to help

people. He says that he is sensitive about his dignity and intellect.

His family, he asserts, still "holds him as young as though he hasn't thought things out for himself." He revolts against "being told." He complains that his room-mates, though very clever, don't fully appreciate him. He dislikes one heartily because of that fellow's "superiority".

K. *Nervousness:* (No report).

L. *Humor:* He reports that he does not like 'kidding'. . . .

In conclusion, the "Subject" says that he "wants to be understood by someone". His mother understands him better than does anyone else. He doesn't talk about himself, at least not to his family.

He asserts that the problem of ambition is as serious to him as the problem of sex. He would like to go into business because he thinks himself competent to manage people. Because he talks about serious things in a light manner, his friends think he is carefree. . . . He enjoys being sarcastic with people, though he usually feels sorry later for having hurt their feelings, particularly the members of his family.

*Inventory No. 43—First Conference*

I. General Remarks by the "Subject."

When he entered, the "subject" asked the question: "Is the training of children between the ages of 6 and 14 most important for life? . . ." Brief discussion by the 'examiner'.

His philosophical reading has of late opened up the

question: Is it worth while to achieve honors? Or shall one go along having a pleasant time? He is not enthusiastic about coming back to college, though his family desires it. He thinks it more worth his while to fall in love, to marry and to settle down. He stresses again: Why study or seek political distinction? He refers to the fact that he was a leader in High School. But Lucretius on "The Nature of Things" and Gray's "Elegy" have made him inquire: What's the good of it all? He confesses to a tinge of pessimism in his attitude. Now love assists him out of this pessimistic mood. He says, quite simply, that love is the only incentive.

His going to college represents but a vague aim in life, whereas if he is married, at least he can settle down. Is eager to write. Thinks he was not bright, naturally, in school, but that he did learn to study. Hence his good marks. Likes books now rather than people. He has never had many intimate friends. He acknowledges that his human sympathy has become warped. In his first year at college he had a contempt for Freshmen as time-wasters and card players. He took life more seriously.

II. Specific Questions addressed to the "Subject" and Answers.

A. *Health:* No problem.

B. *Fears:* Fear of heights; fear of ridicule.

C. *Shyness:* Considers himself reticent, shy. He "hates aggressive people." He found difficulty in adjusting himself to the college environment which represented a sudden shift to a strange, big University. He asserts that he does not confide in anyone.

D. *Ambitions:* No longer very ambitious. He does not think it worth while.

E. *Sex:* Up to 17 had ignored it. Had merely heard or read about it. The effect of this knowledge was one of disgust. He was revolted by the sudden announcement of the divorce of intimate friends of the family. The scandal attaching to this affair disgusted him. He remarks the shallow sincerity among people; that people are out for themselves.

*Inventory No. 43—Second Conference*

E. (Continued.)

The "subject" is interested in a whole variety of questions concerning the importance of sex in the life of young men. For example, he asks: Can sex be reduced to normal proportions by becoming used to it? In reference to the intensity of sex, he asks: How about idealizing love? Isn't there such a thing as love without sex?

He speaks of his repugnance to passion since childhood. He explains the history of his attitude by telling of his passionless childhood when he formed an ideal based on that state. His more recent contact with passion has evoked a feeling of aversion. He explains that he is in love with a girl whom he is ready and eager to marry, emphasizing that he is so fond of her because she is devoid of passion. She, too, thinks herself without passion. He looks upon his present situation as involving a serious problem as to the relation between passion and his childhood ideal. . . . (Discussion of love, sex, disgust, life.

Havelock Ellis's book "Little Essays of Love and Virtue" suggested to the boy as instructive and inspiring, especially as he plays with the idea of getting married.)

F. *Moods:* Yes, very moody. His moods arose some time before his sex problem. Recently, he asserts, his moods have been chiefly due to his sex conflict. He feels a disgust for life and society. He emphasizes that he has always been moody and very seriously so for two years. He also declares that he feels moody after visiting his girl provided any element of passion has been present. He refers to his girl as "cold", though this is said with no sense of condemnation. He refers to his recent studies in philosophy as breeding moods in him.

G. *Worry:* Used to worry a lot. Now is getting over it because of his realization that it is useless. He feels that he has a conscience problem and that is, sex.

H. *Shame:* Yes, in relation to sex. . . . He speaks of his parents as happily married and of the family life as very nice.

I. *Memories:* He is fond of day-dreaming. His reminiscences are not painful in subject matter.

J. *Inferiority:* He speaks of having a "surface sense of inferiority". He finds a dissatisfaction with himself on intellectual grounds.

K. *Nervousness:* Little nervous habits when studying. Jumps readily at any noise as if in anticipation of something about to happen. Refers to a few tantrums in childhood. He speaks of his temperament as fairly equable with a tendency

toward being surly. He stresses his contempt for people and says "The human race was not ideally manufactured; it was not put together as it would have been if I had a crack at it." He alludes to the selfishness of people. His general attitude he calls "a pragmatic attitude toward life." He asserts that optimism is not uppermost in his nature.

L. *Humor:* He says that he is not subject to "kidding" because he keeps to himself.

*Inventory No. 20—First Conference*

I. General Remarks by the 'Subject'.

"Awfully easily kidded". "I haven't the repartee to send back, that's the cause of it." He says that he is easily flustered. He doesn't care much for sports and feels self-conscious in competitive sports of any kind. Physically he acknowledges that he is afraid to fight and that as a child he found the public schools so rough that he was shipped off to a private school. He disliked games.

He recalls the incident when at age eight he was laughed at by a group of children who asked him to spell the word dog backwards and to speak the answer out aloud; when he shouted "god", the children all laughed at him and gave him a sense of being ridiculous which he still recalls with pain. He says that he has gotten into the habit of making fun of himself to entertain others so that he shall be free from their desire to make a butt of him.

The "subject" refers to himself as by nature very social. He has always preferred to live with others but because of being 'kidded' so much he has finally decided to live by himself this year at college. He stresses the

fact that he is serious by nature and admits that he has a poor sense of humor. Of late he is on his guard and feels that he is better at repartee. He refers to his having been the center of interest at home with a resulting self-consciousness. He hates class work because it involves competition. He repeats that he has always done badly in sports and that his mind has never been on baseball or football. Games "seem senseless". But he does enjoy talking and holding conferences with psychiatrists and psychologists concerning his problems. He refers to "compensating all the time". He recalls, too, that teachers way back in his early school days made a butt of him. These memories are still painful.

II. Specific Questions Addressed to the "Subject" and Answers:

(1) *Ailments and pains:* Scarlet fever at seven when he nearly died, and a recurrence of it at age 19 in a milder form. He does not remember having had any other pains in his life.

(2) *Habits:* Moods. . . . In the past he was rather badly afflicted with moods especially of sensitiveness and unhappiness. For the past six months he has maintained a "steady keel". The sources of his moods are several, viz., a lot of trouble with food which, he believes, has so great an effect on people's moods that the whole subject should be given more attention in the psychology class-room.

He also refers his moods to the fact that the important Clubs at Harvard have not invited him to join: he feels excluded and 'out of it'. Finally he assigns his moodiness to the fact

that room-mates often ignore him. He believes that people can tell he is serious and that somehow he can be 'kidded'.

The "Subject" reports as a typical instance of his moods of unhappiness the occasions when he felt so unhappy that he could not continue to study but instead would go out for a walk because a room-mate went out without saying where he was going. He stresses his sensitiveness and his craving for affection which he is "too sensitive to reveal".

The "Subject's" insistent problem is his relation to his parents. Doesn't want family to be so loving to him; hence, behaves coolly especially towards his "doting" parents. Says he hides his life from them because they see only the bright side: he can't "trust their judgments". Parents still love him too emotionally. Can't stand it. They are also very watchful of his moves and behavior, for example, whether the dances he is invited to are being held at respectable places. Father a Unitarian minister who, says the boy, is "awfully prejudiced". Son considers himself very liberal, "almost atheistic and a pagan". Has the habit of doubting everything first, in order to remove the emotion from it because he says he is "too emotional and wants to get rid of it". . . .

*Inventory No. 20—Second Conference* [4]

A. *Health:* good.

B. *Fears:* since childhood he has had several fears,

[4] Questionnaire changed and condensed to conserve time.

such as that friends will "go back on him". He reports fearing that he would not have enough friends. He has always had a fear of high places, though a few years ago he went up the "Eiffel Tower, all right".

C. *Shyness:* the "Subject" speaks of himself as having been "shy always". The roots of his shyness he believes lie in two situations: the meeting of superior people and the life-long problem of being "kidded". He feels that he has been holding his own better this past year. Now for the first time he realizes that he does not "need people so urgently". He says that friendship to him means intimacy; he calls few people his friends, though he makes many acquaintances.

D. *Ambitions:* no clear ambition at present. A year or so ago he hoped to specialize in medicine but because of his incompetence in physics, etc., he has discovered the unwisdom of pursuing medicine. He says that his philosophy has changed "from seriousness to letting things take their course." He leaves things to "chance."

E. *Girls and Sex:* He desires companionship most eagerly. His natural impulse seems always to have been directed toward boys. As a consequence, a crisis arose involving a sex situation which he took up in conference with Dr. Shaw of the Mental Hygiene Department of Harvard. He has never shifted his attitude; he has always preferred boys to girls. Though boys considered him weak, he liked them as companions nevertheless. He says that he avoided girls because of "the ridicule of boys" or the comments of his parents.

However, he says that he has liked girls. He tells of the incident of the girl who fell in love with him when he was fourteen; he did not fall in love with her.

He says that he could "easily fall in love with many girls now", preferably with girls who are "sort of boyish". He tells of two girls whom he has recently grown fond of, "the queerest you ever met". He emphasizes the fact that they are "tomboys" who love sports and outdoor life, and that "they don't like boys" but associate preferably with girls. They like him because he is a good dancer and also because of their common interest in outdoor life, etc. The "Subject" reports, in relation to one of these girls whom he greatly admires and whom he would be willing "to marry tomorrow", that "she feels towards girls as I do towards boys. . . . I don't feel inferior to her as I do to the other one". The attraction, he claims, is purely intellectual and human, wholly without a sexual element.

F. *Moods:* The "Subject", reverting to the ever-present home situation, says that "living at home brings on moods", and also that his folks "take life too seriously", and that in short, he must leave home to solve his problem. At home he feels "down in the mouth".

G. *Worry, Doubt, Conscience:* He refers to his "worrying disposition". He worries about the examinations, about 'kidding' and about his relation to his parents. He has no conscience problem to report. He adds "I am sorry that I was so good a child". He says that his grandmother

(whom he is very fond of as one who understands him) has "naughty memories" and "I wish I had" . . . . The "Subject" stresses his sense of loss in having missed the variety of experience in life. He asserts that he was good "because I was afraid to be bad". He still feels a nervous tension about "getting away with something", a fear element being present which the "Subject" refers to as "a good thing" since it helps to counteract the excessive fear he generally feels. Part of his 'case' against his parents is that they have always played upon his "sympathies to be good."

H. *Shame:* In the past he knew shame but at present he reports none. . . . He repeats that he does not feel lovingly toward girls: no sexual drive. He says that he has never felt a desire to kiss a girl. Of late, however, he has found the companionship of his grandmother so pleasant intellectually that he has taken to kissing her, but, he adds that he "can't kiss her when parents are around". The boy says, quite frankly, that he doesn't want to kiss mother or father.

I. *Memories:* He says that painful experiences recur and that he easily forgets pleasurable experiences. In the past he brooded a lot but now does so no longer.

J. *Inferiority:* He traces his sense of inferiority to several sources: (a) though he studies hard he feels that he does not do well enough in his studies; (b) though he craves to be invited and included, he is humiliated by his exclusion from clubs or by his being ignored by boys whom he is fond of; (c) his inability to be swift at repar-

tee, a lack which makes the problem of "kidding" an unsolvable one.

K. *Nervousness:* He says that he has been nervous all his life.

L. *Humor:* His experiences with the problem of "kidding" have always been painful. He cannot enjoy the humor of a situation when he is made the butt.

*Inventory No. 69—First Conference*

I. General Remarks by the "Subject."

The "Subject" opened his conference by pointing out that his interest is keen in psychoanalysis mainly because of a personal problem that he cannot solve. . . . After a certain amount of hesitancy, he announces that he prefers to go on with the answering of questions rather than with more personal spontaneous narrative.

II. Specific Questions addressed to the "Subject" and Answers.

A. *Health:* Good.

B. *Fears:* At age 11 he had a nightmare involving the theme of burglars. He says that he has "a mild fear" of many things, for example, his fear of sex; a certain continuing dislike of people in general; a fear to mingle with girls; a fear of the sexual act.

(In the midst of his report, the "Subject" exclaims: "How interesting of you to do this!", i.e., to conduct this questioning. He says that he needs a deeper analysis.)

He refers to his dislike of sex as having originated in his childhood when, at age 7 or 8, a case of rape which had occurred in the neighborhood had

become the subject of general conversation and aroused his curiosity. He reports that he had overheard conversation about it without understanding it. He recalls the remark of his parents that it was the "worst possible thing that could be done."

At age 9 or 10, he received his knowledge of sex through his playmates, a boy of 10 and his sister, age 11 or 12. He was told the function of sex organs. No overt behavior. The case of rape was reopened in the newspapers and stirred the "Subject's" interest anew. He says that with his new knowledge of sex he read the accounts quite avidly. He reports his attitude as having contained at the time two parts: he thought rape "bad morally" but personally as a mental picture he did not. Somewhere between ages 10 and 12, the problem of masturbation arose. He traces interest in psychology and psychoanalysis to this problem. He says that his reading of psychoanalysis has broadened his outlook and done him no harm. He asserts that "explanations can't be harmful".

*Inventory No. 69—Second Conference*

The "Subject" opens this conference by alluding to his serious sex problem. He feels "victimized" by masturbation. He says that he is opposed to young marriages, not sexually, but because of his desire to be independent and because marriage is a burden. He tries to solve his problem by "sublimation" and by an intellectual analysis of his feeling. He reports himself a follower of Coué and as interested in hypnosis.

C. *Shyness:* Always, he says. He traces it in part to his great respect for the opinions of older people. This factor is not so prevalent now. He thinks there is no sexual factor underlying his shyness. He looks upon himself as moderately seclusive. He refers to his attitude toward people as a "snob-reaction" because he classifies them on the basis of intellectual status. He likes "intellectual types".

D. *Ambition:* He finds himself aimless now and doesn't care. He is not eager to make a brilliant mark in the world.

E. *Girls:* He says that he is frank with both sexes. He refers to his extraordinarily intimate relation with a sister two years older. For example, he has had no discussion of sex with his parents but he has had frank talks with his sister about his sexual problems. He goes to her when he needs advice and also when he feels caught up in moods.

F. *Moods:* Not at present. But at age 16 he experienced moods involving (1) difficulty of orientation at the University and (2) the sexual problem. He learned at the Fraternity which he joined about men's sex behavior as a result of which his former ideal was injured and a suspicion of the purity of people crept into his mind. He says that "his ideals were shattered." Now he learned that purity did not exist. He relates that he talked the matter out with his sister and that, in answer to his query, she had assured him that it is quite true that men do indulge in promiscuous sex relations.

G. *Worry, Doubt, Conscience:* He is not sure whether he has a habit of worrying; does so only after an unpleasant occasion. No conscience problem. He says that the problem of faith versus reason troubled him with doubt for six months.

H. *Shame:* (No report.)

I. *Memories:* No troubling memories.

J. *Inferiority:* Yes, physically. He was made to feel so because he was always the youngest in the class at school, the other boys being one to four years older. They were also larger. He shunned athletics partly because he was a little afraid of them. He admits to having been pampered at home.

K. *Nervousness:* "No, . . . a little". . . . Slight irritability between ages 6 and 10 and again between ages 13 and 15. He does not believe that his sexual situation is related to his periods of irritability.

L. *Humor:* He asserts that he can stand "kidding", though he reports himself as sensitive and rather easily hurt. He acknowledges that he has something like a family complex, centering around his being Jewish. He refers to his problem in this connection as "a sore spot."

*Inventory No. 1—First Conference*

I. General Remarks by the "Subject."

Masturbation at 14. Feared that it might wreck his life. Consulted a medical book at home which allayed his fear by explaining that the practice was more or less

harmless. From age 14 to 17 he was afraid to go to dances because of the possibility of sex stimulation. His more recent experience with girls produces an effect on sex desire "sometimes good and sometimes bad."

Says that he is always bashful and retiring. He remembers that at age 6 he had a decided preference for a little girl of like age in his class whom he suddenly one day kissed.

His father, a teacher of English, has practiced an unconventional theory (as the boy calls it) with all his seven children in pursuit of "wholesomeness" and purity of sex life. His father has brought up all the children to appear before each other naked, to bathe together, to appear unclothed, to have the family as a whole use the one common bath-room, community-fashion, one member for example bathing, while another washes up, both being naked.

The boy of late has become sex-conscious and doubts the wisdom of his father's unconventional theory. He also narrates the incident in his home several years ago of the little adopted Italian boy who at age 5 or 6 became so fond of the two little sisters, ages somewhere between 6 and 8, that he begged to be allowed to sleep with them and actually put up the little girls to coax their father to permit it. But the father refused to allow it.

It is interesting to note that at one place in his autobiographical narrative, the boy said, "He is my father . . . I never thought of him as a man, of course." He has had no sex discussions with his parents, but recently has had one with a brother three years his senior, who advises that 'petting parties' now and then

are all right as a "safety valve." The brother speaks as a puritan, adds the "subject" in explanation of this counsel.

*Inventory No. 1—Second Conference*

II. Specific Questions addressed to the "Subject" and Answers.

A. *Health:* Good.

B. *Fears:* Troubled by poor marks. (Usually got good marks in childhood.) Fear of authority. He recalls a threat by a teacher in Kindergarten for "cutting up." After that he became excessively good, so the teacher remarked with surprise.

C. *Shyness:* Quite so in childhood. Recently he has become more bold because of his ambitiousness. Does not consider himself a good mixer. Not a club-person. Has few friends. Rooms alone. Not seclusive, however.

D. *Ambitions:* In College he has become disillusioned. Was an "inventive genius" at 15. So he thought. In his Freshman year, with the coöperation of another student, he invented an engine, that is, he worked out the diagrams for it. No tangible result. He has begun to realize his lack of training and has begun to doubt his ability in this direction. However, he is full of schemes and feels that he can do organizing. "At present, I am sort of lost." Seeks a business career because it offers the best pay. His father has tried to cultivate in his son a fondness for literature, but without any success. He says that Edison is one of his idols.

E. *Girls:* Has been attracted to them. Rather shy at first. Not shy with boys, however. Very little shyness with girls now. More recently, he says he has developed boldness on occasion "with blushes."

*Sex:* Has discussed homosexuality with boy friends. Volunteers the information that he has had no personal tendency that way. His tutorial reading in ethics has introduced him to Freudian references on sex. Since age 14 the problem of self-control has been very difficult. Emissions and masturbation at age 15 or 16, when he was working at a summer hotel, drove him to subsist on a vegetarian diet, a suggestion he had got from that medical book at home. Received a little help by this method. He repeats that sex desire remains an unsolved problem. His studies have been interfered with because of it. He says that mingling with girls temporarily intensifies sex desire, though he believes that long detachment is even worse. Believes in "home petting parties" simply to induct young people into sex naturally and "to remove consciousness of wrongdoing." He looks upon dancing as a form of petting, unconsciously. Believes in early marriage, but in his own case does not think of marrying, first because of his financial situation, and secondly because it is hard to meet any girls. He has no difficulty in meeting lots of fellows. "If I had $50,000 I'd marry . . . with my folks' approval."

F. *Moods:* Is not moody. Has an even sort of nature.

G. *Worry:* Mainly about his sex situation. Feels

ashamed, not privately, but when he thinks of his problem in social terms.

H. *Shame:* No serious problem.

I. *Memories:* Nothing in addition to what was narrated in the First Conference.

J. *Inferiority:* Says that he is not burdened with it, though he considers himself "humble."

K. *Nervousness:* None. Recalls that he had the habit of bed-wetting to age 11.

L. *Humor:* Says that he can stand 'kidding'.

In a final bit of narrative he says, concerning his parents, that he is not sentimental about them, but that he respects them. He writes them short letters, because letter-writing seems senseless. He is by temperament rather reserved and his attitude toward life is increasingly practical, so that he continually applies the test of "what's the aim?"

*Inventory No. 6—Conference*

I. General Remarks by the "Subject".

The "Subject" opens the interview wondering whether there is an explanation for what seemed like a case of "mental telepathy" in which he was the amazed participant. In sitting once observing a man measuring a roof near-by, he half-consciously followed the measurement and suddenly, when a near-by onlooker called out to the measurer, What's the length?, the "Subject" reports that he 'unconsciously' and suddenly answered at the very same moment as did the measurer exactly the same figure.

This coincidence the "Subject" referred to as a surprising instance of "mental telepathy" and asked the in-

terviewer "to explain it". . . . The inadequacy of the hypothesis of mental telepathy was briefly discussed.

A second bit of information the "Subject" sought concerns certain card tricks performed by a boy friend. The interviewer pointed out that these performances with cards were not miracles but mere tricks. . . .

II. Specific Questions addressed to the "Subject" and Answers.

A. *Health:* Good.

B. *Fears:* In childhood he had a fear of the dark. At age 4 he developed a fear of punishment as a result of a severe beating by his father. This fear of punishment lingered with the 'Subject' up to age 14. Problem of nightmares occasionally. Recently he has had the fear, now and again, that his parents might die. Another fear that troubles the 'Subject' is the fear of not doing well enough in his studies.

C. *Shyness:* He says of himself that he is not shy but that he does find it hard to make acquaintances. He is not a good mixer. He devotes his time to study. His relationships are "casual, not deep". He agrees that his being the only child with the consequent close relation to his parents which has continued throughout the years, may have something to do with the problem of "not being a good mixer". He says that he often prefers to be alone and is often conscious in a group, especially if there be an odd number of persons, of being "left out of it". He is aware that he doesn't mix well. He acknowledges that he does

not go forward himself but waits to be included and invited into a group.

D. *Ambition:* He has had two clear-cut ambitions, formerly that of medicine and now the law.

E. *Girls and Sex:* He has mingled with ease with both sexes. Since age 14 he hasn't cared so much for girls. He goes to dances alone and "gets along well without them".

(The "Subject", after a pause and some hesitancy, unable to recall the incident at once, proceeds:) "Oh yes, at age 4 I saw a woman feeding a baby at her breast and wondered why a man didn't do it as well."

Somewhere between ages 10 and 12 the "Subject" recalls that he asked his father why it was that it was always the woman who was sick when a baby was born, why wasn't the man? At age 12 he had occasion to see cows giving birth to calves; and now he "understood".

He is not personally troubled by sex but does feel "some consciousness" when the subject is brought up. In his High School days he had an indifferent attitude to sex, treating it like other subjects. His father gave him a talk on sex when he was age 12. Now, the "Subject" asserts, he has an "intellectual interest in sex". Still, his former indifference continues. In fact, he finds sex "unpleasant" and does not "want to have anything to do with it." He narrates the incident of his mother's cook, whose daughter went off to New York City for a trip and when she came back, did so with a baby. The "Subject," who was 16 years of age at the time, thought of

this episode "as a dirty business." He refers to his reaction as "not quite disgust but near it."

F. *Moods:* He says that he feels moody and discouraged if his marks are poor.

G. *Worry, Doubt, Conscience:* He says that he has "no fundamental worries, but minor worries." He recalls that he had something of a conscience problem in grammar school because of "the little tricks" he played.

H. *Shame:* Cannot recall any.

I. *Memories:* (No report.)

J. *Inferiority:* Sometimes. He becomes self-conscious and shrinks physically when in the presence of a very tall fellow.

K. *Nervousness:* He is doubtful whether he should be classed as nervous. He is occasionally so as when, for example, he feels his brain "wound up as if it were going to burst;" his hand trembles and his knees too; he feels "physically intense" then. This reaction is especially likely to occur at examination time. As a child he reports himself as not having been nervous.

L. *Humor:* He asserts that he is "not hurt by kidding."

Finally, he remarks that he is optimistic and that his course in philosophy has been a help in teaching him stoicism.

*Inventory No. 32—Conference*

I. General Remarks by the "Subject."

Problem of bashfulness. Shyness, especially on social occasions, intensely between ages 12 and 18. Feared to mingle in a group, feeling that he might be laughed at.

Because of the affliction of asthma, which he had had for several years until age 12, he felt himself inferior physically. His eyes also troubled him. Because of these troubles he couldn't risk running fast. Hence, he was poor in athletics. These handicaps kept him out of group-life, both at school and generally. When he reached High School he had improved physically somewhat. Still he attended no social affairs because he didn't feel equal to them. Nor could he dance. He says that he still finds it easy to say "No" to invitations.

Somehow he has a feeling of self-abasement in the presence of older people. He mentions the fact that an older brother, eight years his senior, was always quite authoritative, mentally. His teaching of the boy at home implied so much knowledge and superiority in the eyes of the younger brother that the latter developed an enormous sense of inferiority. He says that he "felt like a worm." The superior brother is a Ph.D. from Harvard and a professor of Chemistry. The younger brother has identical ambitions, but is not so confident of himself. He studies little because he has to work for a living, but gets along quite well in College.

Has mingled with boys more easily than with girls. At age 18 he went out for the first time with a girl. Too self-conscious to have gone out before. Enjoys the company of girls.

II. Specific Questions addressed to the "Subject" and Answers.

1. *Ailments, Pains:* Had influenza twice. Suffered from headaches. Also poor eyes, easily tired.
2. *Habits:* (*a*) *Moods:* Likes to be alone. Enjoys indulging in reverie. His reverie is filled with his

ambitions. He has an eagerness to do research work in Physiological Chemistry. He refers to this ambition as "merely a dream at present." . . . Thinks of himself as cynical. Has discovered that people do not appreciate true values. He is not unhappy, in fact he has developed a carefree attitude.

(*b*) *Sex:* "Sex hasn't meant much to me. . . . Oh yes, I guess it has after all. . . . Oh, no, I don't know." . . . (Laughs, suggests that only persons that have had sexual experience can tell, and then says that he is puzzled by the question.) . . . At age 12 or 13 his parents, and more particularly his mother, told him the facts about sex and gave him books to read on the subject. He had sex dreams rather continually from age 14 to age 16 or 17. He attended a co-educational High School and says that possibly the normal human contacts at the school carried over into his dreams. Now he dances and feels at ease.

(*c*) *Concentration:* Always restless. Wants to do something all the time. Considers it fun to be on the go.

(*d*) *Anxiety:* Worried somewhat about the necessary funds to go through college.

(*e*) *Fears:* There was a period as a young boy when he was very much afraid of going into any small place. Is over that fear now. As a child he also feared fire in a house. Had nightmares. His dreams in childhood frequently involved "falling." More recently the fear of not fulfilling his ambition has troubled him. Failure would humiliate him. His parents have drilled into

their sons the idea of prestige, of arriving. He feels that he must make good. Refers to this idea of his parents as "savage prestige."

3. *Personality.* (*a*) *Sociable or seclusive:* He says that he is both.

(*b*) *Day-dreaming:* (Already discussed in the First Conference).

(*c*) *Optimism or pessimism:* "Optimistic . . . no . . . I don't know." . . . Says he broods but without sadness. Hasn't enough time to enjoy life as he should like to, since he has to study and work.

(*d*) *Inferiority:* Yes, decidedly. Sometimes in the class-room. Sometimes with girls at dances. But especially does he have a sense of inferiority in athletics, for example in his favorite sport of wrestling, which he always enters with a sense of doubt and fear, feeling that "everything is going to lick me anyhow . . . so I'm overjoyed when I can win." In his High School days he used to look upon baseball and running as "the acme of physical achievement." But asthma prevented participation in athletics. He has built up an extraordinary efficiency in boxing, in order to hold his own with those who may be disposed to handle him and push him, though he complains with a smile that he has no chance to try it out on anyone.

At age 17 to 18 which he refers to as his unhappy period, he went to the Cambridge Latin School to coach up for the Harvard entrance exams. and found himself without friends and

"out of it." He felt very conscious of his poor clothes and of his inferiority, particularly feeling himself being laughed at. Though an excellent student at High School back home, he had just failed in the entrance examinations to Harvard and as a consequence felt terribly humiliated. He says that it "knocked the bottom out of my plan in life." Admits that he has not yet gotten over that humiliation. He says that often he has a feeling, especially because of his expert wrestling ability, that if he let go he might kill someone, but he thinks he will never let go. He tells, with tears in his eyes, of the torturing humiliation, of being reminded, again and again, in the past few years by a fellow who had made the Harvard entrance examinations, of his own failure to enter Harvard. He witnesses the fact that he controls himself, feeling his hands a-quiver, in the presence of that tormentor, though he is tempted "to let go" and manhandle him. He agrees that his wrestling prowess may be "compensatory."

4. *Behavior Patterns and Problems.* (*a*) *School:* (No further information).

   (*b*) *Clubs:* (Not discussed—lack of time).

   (*c*) *Home: Conflicts, etc.:* None.

   (*d*) *Private matters, doubts, worries, etc.:* (No further information).

   (*e*) *Relation to Men and to Women:* (See First Conference).

5. *Traumatic Experiences.* (*a*) *Shock, physical or mental:* He has been in an auto accident. Not

very serious. "Often unconscious in wrestling bouts for a couple of minutes." No after-effects, apparently.

(*b*) *Shame:* He has nothing to report.

(*c*) *Personal episode:* Yes. Not ashamed. Nothing further to report.

(*d*) *Conscience, remorse, etc.:* He says: "Remorse, yes."

Q. Would you call yourself a rather nervous person?

Ans. Doubtful.

*Inventory No. 2—Conference*

I. General Remarks by the "Subject."

The "Subject" opens the conference by asking, What is there to do about an inferiority complex? . . . He volunteers the opinion that "inferiority is sexual, generally." He wants to be superior to the average, but he doesn't feel that he is and yet is quite certain that he could be. He asserts that it is "painful" to look upon some one as a superior. He tells about his older brother at Princeton whom he looks up to with great admiration; especially in adolescence did he admire that brother as a leader. He admits that this is an influential factor in his own problem of inferiority since he thinks of his brother as always having been more attractive than he, "physically and mentally."

He never went out for any team in his High School days because he didn't think himself capable. He explains that as a result of a "nervous disease" which afflicted him from ages 9 to 14, he did not associate with other fellows. The "rare disease" which he had, induced a kind of "day-dreaming" which was in reality a forget-

ting, involving also states of stupor. He says that he has had a nervous temperament since childhood.

Because of his handicap he felt like a "sissy" physically in High School. Now, however, he is capable of doing physical stunts. As a result of his long illness, he has had a feeling of having to "catch up." He concludes his personal summary by saying that he no longer likes physics in which he used to excel because he now considers it "too set and tame." He says that like his brother he "doesn't emphasize mere knowledge, but life."

II. Specific Questions addressed to the "Subject" and Answers.

A. *Health:* Recently his health has been "fine." He reports that his original nervous disease with its dazed states ceased when his eyes were attended to and corrected.

B. *Fears:* He has a fear of public opinion. He is burdened by a sense of inferiority. He has a fear of "missing the joy of life." He stresses the fact that his studies are "monotonous and painful and lead to nothing."

C. *Shyness:* In the days when he couldn't be with other boys because of his illness, he developed shyness. He says that now he is over it and considers himself "as good a mixer as the average." In reference to his occasional stammering, he asserts that he "has the confidence of his ability to stop stammering by sheer will, if he wishes to."

D. *Ambition:* He feels aimless. He speaks of "not being able to translate his nature into an occupation": also, of his "difficulty in understanding

himself." He feels quite sure that he could make good in many things if he cared to.

E. *Girls and Sex:* He learned about sex from the talk of other boys and from reading. Two years ago his father talked to him briefly about sex. He asserts that he didn't realize the meaning of instinct until several years ago. He dates his knowledge of sex attraction to age 7. He has no sex problem at present.

He says that the question now is whether he can find the right girl. He thinks that his inferiority "complex" has got in the way of his being "the most attractive man in the world." He admits being "hurt by the attractiveness of other men to girls." He says that he is troubled by what he can't be, referring especially to handsomeness. He has idols in the "movies," like the late Valentino.

He speaks of himself as reacting "normally" to sex and stresses the fact that he is not attracted to older girls but would prefer his girl friends to be about 13 years old. When they are older (i.e., 18 years or so), they are "like limousines, too large." He gets bored with them. He confesses to having a secret feeling that he desires in girls "a sense of proportion."

F. *Moods:* "I find myself a many-sided nature." He expresses a sense of dissatisfaction, of not getting the most out of life; of homesickness. He misses his mother.

G. *Worry, Doubt, Conscience:* He has a worrying nature, being specially worried about death and the likelihood of a future life. He says that he

analyzes more than the average. In his Junior year in High School, in the Spring of 1924, he became extremely nervous and had "convulsions of doubt." He paid excessive attention to details, was under various compulsions to think things out in a given order, and was obsessed by religious doubt about the hereafter. He claims that his mother helped him out of this crisis. A physician was also consulted. He remarks that he had been religious but had not gone to church until a few months before the nervous episode occurred. He found himself trying to build up, out of his own imagining and thinking, "a system of my own, leaving nothing standing." He felt driven by fear. The problem of conscience troubled him.

H. *Shame:* He knows of none.

I. *Memories:* (No report).

J. *Inferiority:* (Already discussed).

K. *Nervousness:* He reports nervousness in childhood and "rather nervous" in later years. He refers to his nervousness as "latent" at present.

L. *Humor:* In childhood he says that he found "kidding" painful, but that now he can hold his own. He does not consider himself touchy, though he is sensitive to references concerning his inferiority.

*Inventory No. 9—Conference*

I. General Remarks by the "Subject."

The "Subject" mentions that from childhood up to a year ago he had been troubled by sleep-walking. Last

year he was apparently cured by the method of hypnotic suggestion, by Professor McDougall, at Harvard. Until age 12 he was troubled with bed-wetting. He quotes his father as authority for the fact that he showed "signs of passion" before he was 7 years of age. The "Subject" relates an experience when he was age 7: he invited a little girl of his own age from the neighborhood into his home for sex purposes. His mother happened to come in and she "caught" him undressing the girl. He remembers that he felt ashamed, though his mother did not scold him nor say anything at all. He reports no after-effects of fright or remembered shame. The whole episode is merely conceived in reminiscence as a childish episode. The "Subject" speaks of "passion as running in the family." His father has had twenty children, nine with his first wife and eleven with his second. The "Subject" tells about his having been inducted into masturbation, at age 15, by a man who was stopping at the same country resort. The "Subject" asserts that he did not understand at all the meaning of what was happening. Nevertheless, he acquired the habit of masturbating which he continued for one year. He speaks of having had relapses into the habit since then periodically. He also connects his experiences at "petting parties" with the temptation to masturbate. Hence a year ago he decided to quit going to "petting parties." He says that now he goes with "good girls" who will not encourage him or permit him "to take liberties." He is quite certain that he remembers having understood what sexual intercourse meant as early as age 5. He recites the experience of that period when an older boy of 12 "teased" him about the sex relation between his mother and father and referred to it in shameful language. That, the "Subject" says, made

him angry and eager to attack the other fellow, but it also gave him his first knowledge of the sex relation.

II. Specific Questions addressed to the "Subject" and Answers.[5]

1. *Ailments, Pains:* None.
2. *Habits:* (*a*) *Moods:* The "Subject" reports that he likes to sit for hours in reverie the theme of which usually concerns psychological problems, especially hypnosis, in which he is enormously interested and which he claims to have practised recently at a summer camp for "curing various ailments of several boys." He says of himself that he is not moody.

   (*b*) *Sex:* Reports no worry or shame, no serious problem, except masturbation.

   (*c*) *Concentration:* (No problem).

   (*d*) *Anxiety:* Doubtful of achieving success in his future medical studies because of his great interest in athletics and "in the joy of living."

   (*e*) *Fears:* None.
3. *Personality.* (*a*) *Sociable or Seclusive:* Hs asserts definitely that he is sociable.

   (*b*) *Day-dreaming:* In addition to the reverie, already spoken of, he indulges in "dreams of big ambitions."

   (*c*) *Optimism or Pessimism:* He refers to himself as optimistic.

   (*d*) *Inferiority:* He says that he experiences none.

[5] *Part II: Maturity,* of the first Questionnaire used in the Personal Conferences for a few cases.

4. *Behavior Patterns and Problems.* (*a*) *School: Sensitive, Shy, Aggressive, etc.:* His judgment of himself is that he is "not too shy or aggressive."

(*b*) *Clubs:* Yes, he is a "good mixer."

(*c*) *Home: Conflicts, etc.:* Though conflicts exist in his home, he is "not affected by them."

(*d*) *Primate Matters: Doubts, Worries, Etc.:* No personal worries.

(*e*) *Relation to Men and to Women:* Enjoys talking to women because they are "good listeners" and also because he finds that he talks more freely about everything, including sex, with his girl friends.

5. *Traumatic Experiences.* (*a*) *Shock, physical or mental:* None.

(*b*) *Shame:* None.

(*c*) *Personal Episode:* "Nothing serious."

(*d*) *Conscience, Remorse, etc.:* No problem.

Q. Would you call yourself a rather nervous person? Ans. No.

The "Subject" concludes the interview by saying that he is very touchy on the family situation, especially because of his "Jewish self-consciousness."

*Inventory No. 63—Conference*

I. General Remarks by the "Subject."

He is troubled by a lack of major ambitions. Though in elementary school he had a considerable interest in studies, he had little interest in them in High School; however, he received fair marks. Now that he is in College, he finds himself, though not a bookworm, absorbed

in his studies alone and complains that he has no clear aim at present. Nor has he any idea what to do later. He says that he is troubled by this problem. He may finally take up the study of law. He speaks of himself as not sociable. He makes friendships with difficulty. He remarks that he has belonged to the same clique since his Freshman year. He emphasizes that he "doesn't meet the people he wants to."

II. Specific Questions addressed to the "Subject" and Answers.

A. *Health:* No special problem.

B. *Fears:* He stresses what he calls social fear, i.e., the fear of the kind of impression he is making on people. He is self-conscious as regards his physical appearance and feels handicapped by a personal awkwardness in talk and in manners. A case of "gaucherie." He reports that the High School to which his parents sent him because of its distinction consisted of persons who were beyond him in learning and who were "rich superiors." He alludes to his Jewish self-consciousness since entering Harvard as playing a part in his social fear. He finds that he has aspired to mingle with aristocratic and superior persons in search of social status.

C. *Shyness:* He thinks of himself as shy, and as certainly not aggressive.

D. *Ambition:* (Nothing further to report.)

E. *Girls and Sex:* He refers to his intimacy with his mother rather than with his father. He explains that he has had "too much respect for him" to invite intimacy. He spends a considerable

amount of his leisure time with girls, including "petting parties" and "necking."

When he was 10 or 11 years of age, he first confronted the problem of sex. His mother had somehow found out about his practice of masturbation and had warned him of the danger of insanity. The boy asserts that this warning did not have any serious effect on his behavior, because he didn't believe it. (He explains that he had of his own accord reasoned out that the distance separating the brain from the sex organ was too vast to permit any influence to occur of the kind his mother feared.) When his eyes grew worse, his mother once more warned him that it might be due to his practice, but again he denied it. More recently he wrote to his mother quoting latter-day authority on the error of her assumption.

He confides both in his mother and his boy friends concerning his episodes with girls, though he denies any element of bragging. He believes himself quite passionate, at least he reports that as the judgment of his friends. He asserts that his mother's advice and warning as to how far to go with various girls whom he is fond of is a weighty factor in his conduct. He comments on the fact that he doesn't want to have sex experience with a girl who hasn't because he "wouldn't want to ruin any one's life"; nor does he wish the relation with a girl who has experienced it, because he doesn't respect her sufficiently.

F. *Moods:* Has experienced depression for brief periods of two days or so. He speaks of his sense

of disgust and of his aimlessness. He thinks he has a cynical attitude, even toward sex experience. He experiences moods of solitude; also of irritability.

G. *Worry, Doubt, Conscience:* He is troubled by the fear of not arriving and making good according to his father's expectation. He feels humiliated because of not being able to measure up to his father's scholarly requirements. He receives "no great marks." He refers to the fact that he is lazy. . . . He says that in imagination, at any rate, he has very little conscience.

H. *Shame:* (No report.)

I. *Memories:* When he does experience memories of pain, he loses them as quickly. He speaks of a tendency to reverie and of a difficulty in concentrating well.

J. *Inferiority:* He speaks of the fact that somehow he "can't put himself across here"; but he stresses the enormous hit he made in Palestine when he visited there a couple of years ago. He desires to be "the center of attraction." He can't be so in America. He wants to return to Palestine. . . . His ambition, he repeats, is to live a quiet life, to have an independent income, not to struggle.

K. *Nervousness:* Yes, fairly. He is restless. Has always been fidgety since age 8 or 9. Somewhere between ages 12 and 14, for a period of three weeks, he was afflicted with St. Vitus' dance. He calls attention to the fact that he is always playing with a pencil or tapping on something; also he jumps at a sudden noise. He recalls that in

his childhood he was afraid of the dark and overcame his fear at age 14 or 15. He sleeps well.

L. *Humor:* He declares that he stands "kidding" and also "gives it."

Finally, the "Subject" suddenly mentions that he has a special memory difficulty, rather noticeable at College, as a result of which he forgets faces, names, and the lessons he has studied. He acknowledges that Philosophy, which he likes, he remembers better than History, which he dislikes considerably. He refers to himself as temperamental, as hating discipline, and subject to distractibility.

# CONCLUSION

In the significant words of William Healy: "In every instance I would warn against bare formulations of the different schools of dynamic psychology. It is the uncovering of the facts in the individual case, the unbiased discovery of actual facts that is needed. The richness and variety of the findings flouts any general theory." [1]

Words of wisdom!

[1] Quoted from his illuminating Article in *The New Republic* of October 6, 1926, entitled "As the Twig Is Bent."

LANE MEDICAL LIBRARY
300 Pasteur Drive
Palo Alto, California 94304

Ignorance of Library's rules does not exempt violators from penalties.

50M-10-63-5632

LANE MEDICAL LIBRARY
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
MEDICAL CENTER
STANFORD, CALIF. 94305

K692
S34
1928

Schmalhausen, S.D.
Why we misbehave.

| NAME | DATE DUE |
| --- | --- |
| | |

K692
S34
1928